

LONDON
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
FETTER LANE, E.C. 4

CHICAGO · THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
(AGENT FOR THE UNITED STATES)
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS. MACMILLAN
TOKYO: MARUZEN COMPANY LTD

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*A QUARTERLY JOURNAL EDITED FOR THE
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION*

BY

J. G. ROBERTSON

CHARLES J. SISSON

AND

EDMUND G. GARDNER

VOLUME XXVIII



CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| JOHN GEORGE ROBERTSON | 293 |
| ARTICLES | |
| BLACK, GRETA A., P. J. Bailey's Debt to Goethe's 'Faust' in his 'Festus' | 166 |
| BULLOUGH, G., Fulk Greville, First Lord Brooke | 1 |
| BUTLER, E. M., 'Mansfield Park' and Kotzebue's 'Lovers' Vows' | 326 |
| CARR, CHARLES T., The Position of the Genitive in German | 465 |
| EVANS, B. IFOR, The Sources of Christina Rossetti's 'Goblin Market' | 156 |
| JAMESON, A. K., Was there a French Original of the 'Amadis de Gaula'? | 176 |
| JEFFERY, V. M., Boccaccio's Titles and the Meaning of 'Corbaccio' | 194 |
| JOHNSON, F. C., An Edinburgh Prose Tristan: the 'Bret' | 456 |
| JONES, GWYN, Landnámabók: its Contribution to the Study of the Ice-landic Feud | 217 |
| KASTNER, L. E., Notes on the Poems of Bertran de Born, II | 37 |
| LEECH, CLIFFORD, The Political 'Disloyalty' of Southerne | 421 |
| McILWRAITH, A. K., On the Date of 'A New Way to Pay Old Debts' | 431 |
| MALONE, KEMP, The Suffix of Appurtenance in 'Widsith' | 315 |
| MOORE, W. G., The Literary Quality of Luther's Style | 338 |
| PARKER, ADELAIDE, and E. ALLISON PEERS, The Influence of Victor Hugo on Spanish Drama, III | 205 |
| PARKER, ADELAIDE, and E. ALLISON PEERS, The Influence of Victor Hugo on Spanish Poetry and Prose Fiction | 50 |
| RICHEY, MARGARET F., Some Points of Contact between Wolfram von Eschenbach and Gerbert de Montreuil | 62 |
| ROSS, ALAN S. C., The Linguistic Evidence for the Date of the 'Ruthwell Cross' | 145 |
| SELLS, A. LYTTON, <i>Mohère</i> and <i>La Mothe Le Vayer</i> | 352, 444 |
| SUTHERLAND, JAMES R., Shakespeare's Imitators in the Eighteenth Century | 21 |
| TILLOTSON, ARTHUR, Dr Johnson and the 'Life of Goldsmith' | 439 |
| WRIGHT, B. A., The Alleged Falsehoods in Milton's Account of his Continental Tour | 308 |
| WRIGHT, HERBERT G., An Unpublished Manuscript by Lord Herbert of Cherbury entitled 'Religio Laici' | 295 |
| MISCELLANEOUS NOTES. | |
| ALLEN, HOPE EMILY, The Localisation of Bodl. MS. 34 | 485 |
| BELL, AUBREY F. G., Fernam Lopez and the 'Cronica do Condestabre' | 85 |
| CAMPBELL, ALISTAIR, Old English 'Reord' | 231 |
| CLARK, J. M., The Dialect of the 'Spiegelbuch' | 488 |
| CLARK, J. M., The 'Spiegelbuch' | 87 |
| GIBBS, WARREN E., S. T. Coleridge's 'The Knight's Tomb' and 'Youth and Age' | 83 |
| GREENE, RICHARD L., A Middle English 'Timor Mortis' Poem | 234 |
| MACKIE, W. S., Notes on the Text of the 'Exeter Book' | 75 |
| MATTHEWS, W., A Postscript to 'Shorthand and the Bad Shakespeare Quartos' | 81 |
| OAKDEN, J. P., The Continuity of Alliterative Tradition | 233 |
| REID, T. B. W., An Unrecognised Idiom in Middle French | 240 |
| RHODES, R. CROMPTON, The Mystery of 'The Stage Coach' | 482 |
| SEDFIELD, W. J., The Finn 'Episode' in 'Beowulf' | 480 |
| SEDFIELD, W. J., Further Emendations of the 'Beowulf' Text | 226 |
| SMITH, A. H., Robin Hood | 484 |

| MISCELLANEOUS NOTES (<i>cont.</i>) | PAGE |
|---|------|
| SMITH, G. C. MOORE, Printed Books with Gabriel Harvey's Autograph or MS. Notes | 78 |
| SPINK, GERALD W., Fontane's Poem: 'Walter Scott in Westminster-Abtei' | 489 |
| STARKIE, ENID, An Attempt at Determining the Date of two Letters of Baudelaire | 370 |
| SWAEN, A. E. H., Two Hawking Terms | 368 |
| WHITING, GEORGE W., 'Spiller's Jests' | 238 |
| REVIEWS. | |
| Bale, J., King Johan (J. H. WALTER) | 508 |
| Basile, Giambattista, The Pentamerone, trans. and ed. by N. M. Penzer (EDMUND G. GARDNER) | 399 |
| Baucke, L., Die Erzählkunst in Thackeray's 'Vanity Fair' (ERNEST A. BAKER) | 533 |
| Baxter, J. H., C. Johnson and J. F. Willard, An Index of British and Irish Latin Writers, A.D. 400-1520 (T. A. SINCLAIR) | 500 |
| Bell, Aubrey F. G., Fernão Lopes (WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE) | 120 |
| Bernbaum, Ernest, Anthology of Romanticism and Guide through the Romantic Movement (EDITH C. BATHO) | 387 |
| Blanchard, Marc, La Campagne et ses habitants dans l'œuvre de Honoré de Balzac (L. W. TANCOCK) | 270 |
| Blanchard, Marc, Témoignages et jugements sur Balzac (L. W. TANCOCK) | 270 |
| Bloch, Oscar, Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue française (LOUIS BRANDIN) | 395 |
| Boileau, H. T., Italy in the Post-Victorian Novel (EDITH C. BATHO) | 531 |
| Bond, Richmond P., English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750 (GEORGE KITCHIN) | 527 |
| Bos, K., Religious Creeds and Philosophies as represented by Characters in Sir Walter Scott's Works and Biography (HERBERT G. WRIGHT) | 264 |
| Boswell, Eleanore, The Restoration Court Stage (W. J. LAWRENCE) | 101 |
| Braasch, Theodor, Vollständiges Wörterbuch zur sog. Caedmonschen Genesis (R. GERVAN) | 497 |
| Brightfield, Myron F., The Issue in Literary Criticism (W. D. THOMAS) | 536 |
| Buck, Gerhard, Die Vorgeschichte des historischen Romans in der modernen englischen Literatur (ERNEST A. BAKER) | 533 |
| Burns, Robert, Letters, ed. by J. de Lancey Ferguson (LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE) | 262 |
| Caxton, William, The Book of Fayttes of Armes and of Chyualrye, ed. by A. T. P. Byles (J. P. OAKDEN) | 505 |
| Clapton, G. T., et William Stewart, Les Études françaises dans l'enseignement en Grande-Bretagne (F. C. JOHNSON) | 118 |
| Clark, Arthur Melville, Thomas Heywood (W. P. BARRETT) | 252 |
| Corpus Hamleticum, herausg. von J. Schick (G. C. MOORE SMITH) | 515 |
| Craigie, Sir William A., A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue, I, II (BRUCE DICKINS) | 243 |
| Dargan, E. P., W. L. Crain and others, Studies in Balzac's Realism (L. W. TANCOCK) | 269 |
| Davis, B. E. C., Edmund Spenser (MERRITT Y. HUGHES) | 511 |
| Dempster, Germaine, Dramatic Irony in Chaucer (G. BULLOUGH) | 503 |
| Dieth, Eugen, A Grammar of the Buchan Dialect (HAROLD ORTON) | 498 |
| Dodds, John Wendell, Thomas Southerne, Dramatist (ALLARDYCE NICOLL) | 525 |
| Doran, Madeleine, The Text of King Lear (GEOFFREY TILLOTSON) | 251 |
| Dryden, J., The Songs of, ed. by Cyrus Lawrence Day (HAROLD WILLIAMS) | 523 |

| REVIEWS (<i>cont.</i>) | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| Dunbar, William, Poems, ed. by W. Mackay Mackenzie (BRUCE DICKINS) | 506 |
| Ehrismann, Gustav, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters, I, 2te Aufl. (A. C. DUNSTAN) | 283 |
| English Lyrics of the Thirteenth Century, ed. by Carleton Brown (J. P. OAKDEN) | 376 |
| Evans, A. W., Warburton and the Warburtonians (JAMES R. SUTHERLAND) | 526 |
| Exeter Book of Old English Poetry, The, ed. by R. W. Chambers, Max Förster and Robin Flower (R. PRIEBSCHE) | 491 |
| Fairley, Barker, Goethe as revealed in his Poetry (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) | 123 |
| Felkin, F. W., Goethe a Century after (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) | 123 |
| Franz, Erich, Goethe als religiöser Denker (W. H. BRUFORD) | 127 |
| Gardiner, Alan H., The Theory of Speech and Language (W. E. COLLINSON) | 285 |
| Geers, G. J., en J. Brouwer, De Renaissance in Spanje (WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE) | 282 |
| Gerould, Gordon Hall, The Ballad of Tradition (EDITH C. BATHO) | 246 |
| Giglois, ed. by Charles H. Livingston (EDMUND G. GARDNER) | 117 |
| Gray, Charles Harold, Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795 (JAMES R. SUTHERLAND) | 258 |
| Greg, W. W., Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses (E. K. CHAMBERS) | 95 |
| Greg, W. W., English Literary Autographs, 1550-1650 (G. C. MOORE SMITH) | 384 |
| Haut Livre du Graal, Le; Perlesvaus, ed. by William A. Nitze and T. Atkinson Jenkins (EDMUND G. GARDNER) | 117 |
| Höfding, Harald, Jean Jacques Rousseau and his Philosophy (FREDERICK C. ROE) | 267 |
| Holthausen, F., Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (R. GIRVAN) | 375, 496 |
| Hoops, Johannes, Beowulfstudien (R. GIRVAN) | 244 |
| Hoops, Johannes, Kommentar zum Beowulf (W. J. SEDGEFIELD) | 373 |
| Jaberg, K., und J. Jud, Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz (JOHN ORR) | 271 |
| Joesten, Maria, Die Philosophie Fieldings (ERNEST A. BAKER) | 533 |
| John III, King of Portugal, Letters, ed. by J. D. M. Ford (WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE) | 120 |
| Kany, Charles E., Life and Manners in Madrid, 1750-1800 (WILLIAM C. ATKINSON) | 541 |
| Kitchin, George, A Survey of Burlesque and Parody in English (F. S. BOAS) | 387 |
| Kostka, Sister Maria, The Old Woman (EDITH C. BATHO) | 531 |
| Kraus, Russell, Haldeen Braddy and C. Robert Kase, Three Chaucer Studies (G. H. COWLING) | 501 |
| Lafourcade, Georges, Swinburne (ERNEST A. BAKER) | 265 |
| Las Vergnas, Raymond, W. M. Thackeray (ERNEST A. BAKER) | 533 |
| Lewis, Charles Bertram, Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance (JESSIE CROSLAND) | 114 |
| Lussky, A. E., Tieck's Romantic Irony (J. G. ROBERTSON) | 130 |
| McHenry, Margaret, The Ulster Theatre in Ireland (EDITH C. BATHO) | 531 |
| Marlowe, C., The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus, ed. by Frederick S. Boas (PERCY SIMPSON) | 379 |
| Mello, D. Francisco Manuel de, Epanáforas de vária História Portuguesa, ed. by Edgar Prestage (WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE) | 120 |
| Milton, The Early Lives of, ed. by Helen Darbishire (B. A. WRIGHT) | 518 |
| Milton, J., Paradise Regained, ed. by E. H. Blakeney (B. A. WRIGHT) | 105 |

REVIEWS (*cont.*)

PAGE

| | |
|---|-----|
| Milton's Private Correspondence and Academic Exercises, trans. by Phyllis B. Tillyard, ed. by E. M. W. Tillyard (B. A. WRIGHT) | 259 |
| Myers, A. M., Representation and Misrepresentation of the Puritan in Elizabethan Drama (EDITH C. BATHO) | 531 |
| Paradise, N. Burton, Thomas Lodge (W. P. BARRETT) | 249 |
| Paris Psalter, The, and the Meters of Boethius, ed. by G. P. Krapp (BERTRAM COLGRAVE) | 495 |
| Poetical Rhapsody, A., ed. by Hyder E. Rollins (GEOFFREY TILLOTSON) | 516 |
| Prestage, Edgar, the Chronicles of Fernão Lopes and Gomes Eannes de Zurara (WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE) | 120 |
| Price, L. M., The Reception of English Literature in Germany (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) | 390 |
| Ralli, Augustus, A History of Shakespearian Criticism (BARRY GARRAD) | 98 |
| Reesink, H. J., L'Angleterre et la littérature anglaise dans les trois plus anciens périodiques français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709 (J. G. ROBERTSON) | 389 |
| Renzulli, Michele, La Poesia di Shelley (HERBERT G. WRIGHT) | 529 |
| Rickert, Heinrich, Goethes Faust (W. H. BRUFORD) | 127 |
| Robertson, J. G., The Life and Work of Goethe (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) | 123 |
| Schmidt-Rohr, Georg, Die Sprache als Bildnerin der Völker (A. C. DUNSTAN) | 393 |
| Schoffler, Herbert, Die Anfänge des Puritanismus (MERRITT Y. HUGHES) | 248 |
| Schöffler, Herbert, Die Politische Schulung des englischen Volkes (MERRITT Y. HUGHES) | 248 |
| Sells, Arthur Lytton, The Early Life and Adventures of Jean Jacques Rousseau (FREDERICK C. ROE) | 267 |
| Snorre Sturlason, Heimskringla, ed. by Erling Monsen (EDITH C. BATHO) | 284 |
| Spenser, Edmund, Works, ed. by Edwin Greenlaw, C. G. Osgood, F. M. Padelford, I (W. L. RENWICK) | 508 |
| Spindler, Robert, Die Alpen in der englischen Literatur und Kunst (B. IFOR EVANS) | 531 |
| Sterner, Lewis G., The Sonnet in American Literature (EDITH C. BATHO) | 531 |
| Szogs, Siegfried, Aspremont (JESSIE CROSLAND) | 396 |
| Taylor, Archer, 'Edward' and 'Sven i Rosengård' (EDITH C. BATHO) | 246 |
| Thornbury, Ethel M., Henry Fielding's Theory of the Comic Prose Epic (G. KITCHIN) | 110 |
| Todd Memorial Volumes, ed. by John D. Fitzgerald and Pauline Taylor (WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE) | 288 |
| Tompkins, J. M. S., The popular Novel in England, 1770-1800 (ERNEST A. BAKER) | 533 |
| Tonelli, Luigi, L'Amore nella poesia e nel pensiero del rinascimento (C. FOLIGNO) | 538 |
| Traherne, Thomas, Poetical Works, ed. by Gladys M. Wade (GEOFFREY TILLOTSON) | 386 |
| Van Tieghem, Paul, La Littérature comparée (I. M. MASSEY) | 132 |
| Van Tieghem, Paul, Le Prérromantisme (I. M. MASSEY) | 132 |
| Vercelli Book, The, ed. by G. P. Krapp (B. COLGRAVE) | 93 |
| Vercelli-Homilien, Die, herausg. von Max Forster (B. COLGRAVE) | 93 |
| Vossler, Karl, Lope de Vega und sein Zeitalter (WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE) | 400 |
| Waller, R. D., The Rossetti Family, 1825-1854 (L. C. MARTIN) | 113 |
| Watson, Harold F., The Sailor in English Fiction and Drama, 1550-1800 (G. KITCHIN) | 111 |
| Weaver, Bennett, Toward the Understanding of Shelley (HERBERT G. WRIGHT) | 264 |
| Weber, Anton, George Gissing und die soziale Frage (ERNEST A. BAKER) | 533 |
| Williams, Charles, The English Poetic Mind (B. E. C. DAVIS) | 112 |

REVIEWS (*cont.*)

PAGE

| | |
|---|-----|
| Willinsky, Margarete, Bischof Pereys Bearbeitung der Volksballaden und Kunstgedichte seines Foho-Manuskriptes (HERBERT G. WRIGHT) | 528 |
| Willis, Leota S., Francis Lenton, Queen's Poet (EDITH C. BATHO) | 532 |
| Wits, The, or Sport upon Sport, ed. by John J. Elson (W. J. LAWRENCE) | 254 |
| Wolfram, Richard, Ernst Moritz Arndt und Schweden (R. J. MCCLEAN) | 542 |
| Zeydel, Edwin H., Ludwig Tieck and England (J. G. ROBERTSON) | 130 |

SHORT NOTICES.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Alfonsi, T., Il dialetto còrso nella parlata Balanina | 410 |
| Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature, The, XI, ed. M. S. Serjeantson | 133 |
| Barbi, M., Dante: Vita, opere e fortuna | 547 |
| Bithell, J., Germany | 408 |
| Bühler, C. F., The Sources of the Court of Sapience | 290 |
| Bullettino degli studi inglesi in Italia | 546 |
| Burkhard, A., Conrad Ferdinand Meyer | 548 |
| Christmas Carols printed in the Sixteenth Century, ed. by E. B. Reed | 291 |
| Crawford, A. W., The Genus of Keats | 544 |
| di Francia, L., La leggenda di Turandot nella novellistica e nel teatro | 409 |
| Granville-Barker, H., Associating with Shakespeare | 135 |
| Hayens, K. C., Grimmelshausen | 409 |
| Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages, I | 290 |
| Liljegren, S. B., Harrington and the Jews | 291 |
| Malone Society's Collections, II, III | 404 |
| Mann, W., Drydens heroische Tragödien als Ausdruck höfischer Barockkultur in England | 544 |
| Massinger, P., The Bondman, ed. by B. T. Spencer | 135 |
| Medium Ævum, I, 1 | 134 |
| Millican, C. B., Spenser and the Table Round | 291 |
| Miscellany of Studies presented to L. E. Kastner, A | 409 |
| Partridge, E., Literary Sessions | 546 |
| Pepys Ballads, The, ed. by H. E. Rollins, VIII | 404 |
| Propst, L., An Analytical Study of Shelley's Versification | 545 |
| Scheda Cumulativa Italiana, La | 547 |
| Shakespeare Allusion-Book, ed. by J. Munro | 135 |
| Sibbald, Sir R., Memoirs, ed. by F. P. Hett | 405 |
| Studies in English, University College, Toronto | 407 |
| Tillyard, E. M. W., Milton: L'Allegro and Il Penseroso | 405 |
| Van Doorn, W., Of the Tribe of Homer | 136 |
| Walraf, E., Soziale Lyrik in England, 1880-1914 | 546 |
| Watt, W. A., Shilling Shockers of the Gothic School | 407 |
| Year's Work in English Studies, The, XI, ed. by F. S. Boas | 133 |

FULK GREVILLE, FIRST LORD BROOKE

'I know the world and believe in God,' wrote Fulk Greville in 1613¹, and this confession gives us a key to his whole life, for it suggests the duality in his mind which contributed so much to the mediocrity of his external career and to the bewildering irony of his verse treatises. He knew the world: through the vicissitudes of a long life at Court, he was trusted by three monarchs, and held by the greatest of these as her most permanent favourite. He believed in God: staunchly Protestant and ever conscious of the great gulf fixed between the elect and the many, he set Divine above earthly truth. Yet the interest his mind has for us consists not in the simple perception of these two sides of his nature, but in the conflict between them. The recognition of a cleavage between the ideal and the actual formed part of the stock-in-trade of most Elizabethan poets and moralists; but it was usually alleviated, as in the case of Spenser, by a somewhat facile Platonism, or, as in many forerunners of William Browne, by an escape into the Utopia of pastoral convention. In Greville, however, the fissure ran deep and unbridged, affecting his actions as well as his philosophy. Uneasily conscious of the incompatibility of the two worlds, he tried to make the best of both. Capable of the most intense and lifelong devotion, he proved himself the most assiduous of clients; cherishing the memory of Philip Sidney, he attached himself in turn to Essex, Cecil, Rochester and Buckingham, attaining to wealth and some degree of power by humble homage and day labour. The most thoughtful courtier of his age, he walked the tight rope with skill; but he knew the trick for the Lilliputian game it was, and if he truckled to power and expediency, he never lost his sense of ultimate values. 'I hope the latter end of my life will be more free and absolute,' he wrote about 1600, 'for hitherto I have drawn my breath by no other tenure but multiplicity of respects².' He had then still twenty years of time-serving to undergo.

The definitive biography of the poet cannot be written until careful examination has been made of the Star Chamber and other state documents, together with the unpublished Cecil papers. In the meantime it is possible to supplement the brief account by the late Sir Sidney Lee in the *Dictionary of National Biography* with some notes based on the *Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission* and the *Calendars of State Papers*.

¹ Hist. MSS. Earl Cowper, I, p. 77.

² *Ibid.*, I, p. 27.

Greville's father, 'old Sir Fulk,' of Beauchamp Court in Warwickshire, was a bluff country gentleman fond of bearbaiting and other sports, a friend of Burleigh, well liked by the Queen, and much 'esteemed for the sweetness of his temper.' His name appears occasionally in records as muster-master for the county, as an examiner of recusants, and as a landlord who quarrelled with his neighbour Sir Thomas Leighton¹. In old age he seems somewhat to have forgotten the dignity of his years, but to have repented during an illness, for we find his son writing, about 1600:

I am glad my father hath feeling of his estate because at those years it is part of a man's reputation, and it was mischance that his excellent nature was not ever trained up in the best company because ever since I know him he has been wise with the wise and provident among good husbands but pleasure is the commonest end of men and the greater tide hath carried him away².

The grant to the family in 1604 of 'the castle of Warwick, the vineyard house, castle mills, and meadow land adjoining,' which the poet improved so magnificently, was the fulfilment of an ambition of his father, who in a characteristic letter had three years previously tried to buy the place cheaply from the Queen through Cecil. His own house, he wrote, 'threateneth every day to fall upon me':

Now Sir, the Queen hath the runs of a house in this country which hath been a common gaol these ten or twelve years; the walls down in many places hard to the ground; the roof open to all weathers, the little stone building there was, mightily in decay; the timber lodgings built thirty years ago for herself, all ruinous,...so as in very short time ther will be nothing left but a name of Warwick.

After flattering the Queen's 'sweet eyes,' he concluded humorously:

I pray you therefore, play my part well, and since the world saith all courtiers more naturally love bribes in this age than in the former, I will give you the finest high-flying tercel that ever you were master of³.

In the year before his death the old man gave ample proof of his vigour when his promptitude in pursuing the Gunpowder plotters and raising the county led to many arrests in Warwickshire. He hoped, he jubilantly informed Salisbury, to be able to send him a traitor's horse taken in his town⁴.

From his father Greville inherited a love of hawks and horses which his delicate health never weakened, together with a taste for gallantry which made him, though a sworn bachelor, 'a constant courtier of the ladies' (Naunton), earning among the maids of honour (according to Bacon) the reputation of a 'Robin Goodfellow.' Like Sidney, the companion of his boyhood and youth, he aspired to a life of action, participating in tilts

¹ *Cal. S P.* 1594, *Addenda*, p. 363; cf. Salisbury MSS., v, p. 24, and x, p. 10.

² Hist. MSS. Earl Cowper, i, p. 28.

³ Hist. MSS. Salisbury, xi, p. 433, October 17, 1601.

⁴ *Cal. S P. Dom.* 1605, pp. 246, 271: *Add.* pp. 468, 9.

and tournaments, and planning adventures abroad which were prevented only by the jealous commands of Elizabeth, as he related in his *Life of Sidney*. It was, indeed, only after four attempts at escape that his youthful fire was schooled 'to bound my prospects within the safe limits of duty, in such home services, as were acceptable to my Sovereigne' (*Life*, p. 149). Having thus surrendered his independence of spirit, he never again broke away from the bondage of Court, but sought preferment there as messenger and confidant.

He owed much to the Sidneys; to Sir Henry, the first Welsh post with the Council of the Marches which led to the lucrative Secretaryship of the Council of Wales, held for the rest of his life; to Sir Philip, an intellectual and poetical stimulus never forgotten by his more sober and 'creeping genius.' These debts, however, he paid with a constant fidelity, perpetuating, and in a way, solidifying the fame of his brilliant friend by showing him to have been a statesman as well as a poet and critic. A letter to Archibald Douglas speaks of his grief at Philip's death:

The only question I now study is whether weeping sorrow, or speaking sorrow, may most honour his memory, that I think death is sorry for. What he was to God, his friends and country, fame hath told, though his expectation went beyond her good. My Lord, give me leave to join with you in praising and lamenting him, the name of whose friendship carried me above my own worth, and I fear hath left me to play the ill poet in my own part¹.

In November, 1586, he made an effort to save the *Arcadia* from the piratical printers: twenty-nine years later he was preparing plans and inscriptions (never executed) 'for Philip's long promised tombe.... The place is Paul's Church where he lies open':

Touching the form and matter of the sepulchre, it is shortly this. Two dainty large stones of touch delicately forbished borne up one above another by four pillars of brass three foot and a half high and double gilt; the uppermost worthily his, the other mine. Now because I would not mar the delicacy of the stones or embase their lustre with adding anything to cover it, I have devised a pillar of the same touch raised above and yet disjoined from the tomb and placed at the upper end of Sir Philip's which shall carry scutcheons for his arms and inscriptions to be graven upon it in gilded letters; and in like manner at the lower end saving only half the tomb high a more humble one to carry mine².

Although it was through Sidney that Greville first came to the Queen's notice, he was soon more to her than a mere shadow of Philip. In 1580 he proved his competence as messenger, in Ireland, between Pelham and Sir William Winter³; other missions followed⁴; and after Sidney's death

¹ Hist. MSS. Salisbury, III, p. 189, October, 1586.

² Hist. MSS. Earl Cowper, I, p. 90.

³ *Cal. of Carew MSS.* (1575-88), p. 280, etc.

⁴ For the earlier Casimir embassy, cf. M. W. Wallace's *Sidney*, pp. 174 ff.; for the visit to Orange (1582), *ibid.*, p. 277 and *C. S. P. For.* (1581-2), pp. 595, 6; 609; 633. With Henry of Navarre in 1587, cf. *Hist. MSS. Various Coll.*, Vol. VII, p. 348.

he became more and more the man of affairs, laying the foundations, with the Queen's favour, of the great fortune which made him one of the most envied men of his time. In 1587 he received the grant of the estates in Derbyshire forfeited by the recusant Lord Paget¹. When a mutiny broke out, next year, in the fleet, he acted as Her Majesty's delegate to settle the trouble.

He received great support from the new chief favourite, Essex, for whom he felt an admiration which outlasted disgrace and death. After the capture of a carrack in 1587 we find Essex protesting vehemently against the setting up of a secret commission to survey the prize, to the disadvantage of Greville, who was by grace to have it of Her Majesty. 'It doth much trouble me that so indirect a course is taken to prejudice my Cousin Grevill and to disgrace myself besides².'

But success at Court brought him enemies. Gallant and eloquent though he was, he could not be all things to all men, and a suspicion of insincerity attended his deliberate embarkation on a 'multiplicity of respects.' Hence Thomas Fowler, whose house had been searched for treasonous papers, wrote to Douglas in 1588:

For Fulk Greville, my wife knows he hath offered her courtesy already, and will again, the rather if she seek him, but he is not for her credit. Yet let her do as she please, he will but deceive her, as he hath done others of her sex. He owes me £20, and therefore must show to favour my case, but he will not offend the Earl of Essex for a hundred such as I. It may be he will do my wife some pleasure. Let her take it. I never trusted him with a word of my mind or thought³.

'Robin Goodfellow' had his darker side; but if, facile in promises, he performed less than he offered, he became the hope of all kinds of suitors, and where his sympathies were aroused, used his influence judiciously. How often, in his heyday, did he recommend 'bearer' to Cecil's good graces! He earned the gratitude of Sir Robert Sidney⁴, corresponded with Andrew Downes over 'a place to be void in Eton College⁵,' and obtained for Launcelot Andrewes the Deanery of Westminster⁶. When Sir John Davis, Keeper of the Tower Ordnance, lay in prison after the Essex rising, he begged Cecil to remove his shackles, but it was Greville whom he wished to hear his explanations⁷. His benefactions to Camden and Speed are well known. For Samuel Daniel, whose work influenced, and was influenced by, his own, he tried (and not in vain) to obtain an

¹ Hist. MSS. App. 4th Report.

² Hist. MSS. App. 4th Report, Bagot MSS., p. 329, September 16, 1588.

³ Hist. MSS. Salisbury, III, pp. 374-5, November 25, 1588.

⁴ Hist. MSS. Salisbury, XII, p. 445, October 16, 1602.

⁵ Hist. MSS. Earl Cowper, I, p. 31.

⁶ Salisbury MSS., XI, pp. 236 and 245, June, 1601.

⁷ *Ibid.*, XI, pp. 101, 151, March, 1600-1.

ecclesiastical living: in the postscript to a letter of April 8, 1595, he wrote to Cecil:

The parsonage in the Isle of Wight, which I moved her Majesty for Samuel Danyel, and which she was pleased to be certified of by you from your father, is called Shawflete. There is some 12 years to run; he desires so many in reversion as she shall think fit. Sir, you shall do a good deed to help the poor man, many will thank you¹.

For John Lyly, on the other hand, he seems to have done nothing, though mentioned anxiously in the letters of that indefatigable petitioner².

Deep in Essex's confidences, Greville acted frequently as an intermediary between him and the Queen, or between the administration and the fleet. In 1595, between two bouts of illness, he was at Rouen with Lord Rich, who praised him thus to Essex:

Mr Fouk Grevyll, in my Lord of Shrewsbury's passage by sea, behaved himself so excellently in his kind, that I hope your Lordship will be a means for his preferment to make him a King, which long since he hath deserved in Her Majesty's service, and I doubt since his landing the sea air hath nothing altered his complexion, having with him so good a physician as Sir Henry Palmer for his comfort³.

As a result of the favourite's commendation (cf. Devereux, *Lives of Earl of Essex*, 1, p. 417), Greville obtained the rangership of Wedgnoek Park in the following year. His main object, however, was a permanent post of importance, to which end he continued his tactful service during the preparations for the 'Island Voyage⁴.' Not until September, 1598, however, was he rewarded with the office of Treasurer of the Navy, after much anxiety and disappointment and appeals to Cecil, to whom he wrote,

not out of any particular interest I challenge in you, but in the quality of your place.... It is now almost two years since I have languished in the suit of this place, I trust without undue importunacy either to her Highness or you, and, I protest, without other glory or ambition in it than first to think I should be of her own choice, and then that in her service I should have pour un champ d'honneur un siecle corrompu.... If there were any notorious impotency or stain in me; nay, if the place were very much greater than I, these cautions and councils of time were gentle corrections. But since I am her Majesty's creature, and by her goodness in a degree which hath led up to the greatest advancements, give me leave, howsoever unworthy, yet for the honour of that place, to marvel why this competency between me and Langford and so long continued, and Sir, conclude it to be chance or destiny, for the world shall never make me believe that her Majesty valueth either our faiths, sufficiencies or gages equal. Besides, she in her princely nature knoweth that I have commanded mine own genius, and left all other courses in the world that advance other men, only for her sake: which zeal alone hath so many times been made a merit, as I cannot think myself only chosen to be lost there. Now Sir, if as a councillor you see that service suffers in this delay with me, be pleased to let your care deliver both: for if Seneca say true, Qui diu

¹ Salisbury MSS., v, p. 166, April 8, 1595.

² Cf. *Works*, ed. W. Bond, 1.

³ Salisbury MSS., vi, p. 415, Rich to Essex.

⁴ *Ibid.*, vii, pp. 291, 369, 370, 382, etc.

dubitat, etiam matri negare potest, as the world is now possessed, were I disabled for ever...¹.

It is apparent from the tone of this missive that Greville held Cecil as partly responsible for the delay.

By virtue of his new duties, he was now officially associated with Howard and Raleigh in naval matters, though he does not seem to have seen any fighting. In 1599, when the fleet was mobilised against the Spaniards who were then collecting ships at Corunna in preparation for an attack on the Netherlands, it was proposed to make him a rear-admiral, and he was given command of the *Triumph*, the largest vessel, of 1000 tons and 68 guns. It was, perhaps, fortunate that the rumour of invasion was merely a false alarm, since the condition of the fleet at this time was more than usually deplorable. Thus we find Greville and his colleagues writing from 'Her Majesty's good ship the *Elizabeth Jonas* in the Downs':

both our drink, fish and beef is so corrupt as it will destroy all the men we have, and if they feed on it but a few days, in very truth we should not be able to keep the seas... for as the companies in general refuse to feed on it, so we cannot in reason or conscience constrain them. So we fear that your commandment to us to leave some store of victuals (upon our return) among the other ships will not be possible².

In the next year Greville took part in the inquiries leading to the foundation of the East India Company. When the Society of Adventurers desired a charter to embark on their first tentative voyages of exploration and trade, they presented to the Queen a memorial in which they described the countries and ports where Spain could not legally claim a trading monopoly. Elizabeth, wishing to test their statements, thereupon asked Greville through Walsingham for a summary of the trafficking of Spanish and Portuguese in the East. His reply was a long and orderly geographical catalogue, of which the following extracts will suffice to show the character:

Sr.—You demaunde of me the names of such kings as are absolute in the East, and either have warr, or traffique wth the Kinge of Spaigne. I will beginne in Barbarie, with the kingdoms of Fez and Morocco, w^{ch} have either of them vi or vii pettie kingdoms of Gaulata, tombuto, and Melly; wherof the firste is poore, and hath smale traffique; the second populous, and rich in corne and beasts, but wanteth salte, w^{ch} the Portugal supplieth; the last hath store of corne, flesh, and cotten woll, w^{ch} are carried into Spaigne in great abundance....

From Melinde to the Cape of Guardafuy are many petty kingdoms, possessed by the white Mahometans, the chief whereof are Pate, Brava, Magadoxo, and Amffion. At the said Cape the Portugalls yeerly lye in wayte for the Turkish shippes, w^{ch} adventure to traffique without their licence, houldinge themselves the only comaunders of these seas. From the Cape to the mouth of the Red Sea are also many smale dominions of

¹ Salisbury MSS., VIII, p. 347, 1598.

² *Ibid.*, IX, p. 336, August 31, 1599. For the mobilisation see W. L. Clowes, *The Royal Navy*, I, p. 529.

the white Mahometans, rich in gould, sylver, ivory, and all kinds of victualls; and behind these countries, in the mayne, lyeth the great Empire of Prester John, to whom the Portugalls (as some writers) doe yeerly send 8 shippes, laden wth all kynde of merchandise, and also furnish themselves wth many sayllers owt of his coast towns in the Red Sea...

Theis collections I have made out of Osorius, Eden's Decads, and spetially owt of the voyages of John Hughen, having neyther meanes nor tyme to seak other helpes. This, as it is, I recomend it unto you, wth my love and good will: From London, this Xth of March 1599 (1600). Yo^r verie lovinge frende, ..

This letter is given in full by John Bruce in his *Annals of the Honourable East India Company*, I, pp. 121-6. Permission for a venture was granted in September, 1600, the Charter following in December. Greville, later, as we shall see, had further, and closer, dealings with the Company.

Meanwhile the man on whose shoulders Greville had risen was himself in decline. At New Year, 1599, Essex wrote to his friend:

If you wonder that now in this time of general offerings you hear not from me, you must wonder also that in the eve of the last year the Queen having destined me to the hardest task that ever any Gentleman was sent about, she hath yet [thought] to ease her rebels in Ireland of some labour by breaking my heart [with her hardness]. When my soul shall be freed from this prison of my body, [she] will then see her wrong to me and her wound given to herself, and the faults of those whom now she [cherishes] will revenge all my unkindnesses... But how much soever Her Majesty despiseth me she shall know she hath lost him who for her sake would have thought danger a sport and death a feast; yea I know I leave behind me such a company as were fitter to watch by a sick body than to recover a sick State....I had sent sooner to you if I had been well this morning¹.

Later, from Ireland, Essex wrote to Greville when too busy to send to any other friends. The affection between them did not diminish, though Greville could not hope for further advancement while he remained close to Essex:

In my other Court business [he wrote (c. 1600)] I have moved the Queen, and find her as gracious as I can desire but the lame must have an Angel's help into the Pool of Silo which I lack notwithstanding my Lord of Essex deals clearly and kindly with me which makes whatsoever comes else the lighter, for my eyes have ever been upon the goodwill and not the power of my friends, and I have both strength and kindness enough to suffer with them that can love².

Loyal he remained to the last, for although patriotism as well as prudence led him to take the Queen's side at the crisis, and even to help in the siege of Essex House, we can accept as sincere the panegyric in the *Life of Sidney* and Greville's account of himself as 'a kind of Remora, staying the violent course of that fatall Ship,' until he was 'abruptly sent away to guard a figurative Fleet...and kept (as in a free Prison) at Rochester, till his head was off.'

Once Essex was removed, Greville's friendship with him increased his favour with the remorseful Queen. Possessing influence without responsibility, he seems to have sought no promotion during the rest of her

¹ Salisbury MSS., ix, p. 4.

² Hist. MSS. Earl Cowper, I, p. 28.

reign. But he did not neglect the power of her principal Secretary, with whom he had many dealings. The complete story of his relations with Cecil will not be known until the unpublished Salisbury papers are made accessible. Sir Henry Wotton ascribed Greville's failure to attain high office during Cecil's lifetime to Cecil's jealousy. At present we have no proof of this, but the letter quoted above suggests that Greville suspected Cecil of delaying his appointment as Naval Treasurer, while it will be seen later that a coldness arose between them after 1604. From 1598 to 1604, however, they were on increasingly friendly terms.

At first, no doubt, Cecil had viewed with suspicion the ambitions of one working hand in glove with Essex, since Essex had tried to prevent his advancement and, according to Sir Thomas Bodley, 'sought by all devices to direct the liking of the Queen' away from him. But the Secretary, who bore patiently the malice of Essex's rasher dependants, 'showing no gall,' and acting honourably towards his enemy until the end, could not fail to discover in Greville a nature too cautious and too scrupulous for faction. Their official correspondence during Greville's tenure of the Navy Office was always amiable, though they were never intimate, Cecil came to respect his subordinate, and did him many small services; the tone of the poet's letters, on the other hand, changes from an initial diffidence to an assurance of Cecil's goodwill which falters for a time after Elizabeth's death, is temporarily recaptured, but gradually declines and vanishes by 1606 in an almost obsequious humility. Thus, in 1599, Greville thanked Cecil for 'the honour you have done me in the whole course of this journey, both to join me with your dearest friends, and besides so kindly to advertise me in common with them¹.' Two years later, when kept from Court by sickness, he begged the Secretary to carry his excuses, so that he might avoid giving 'to the blessed lady whom I devoutly serve, the least scruple of negligence, or imagination that I preferred anything before the admiration and joy of her presence, which at this time I only forbear, to cherish health, and yet that but to wear out the rest of a broken life at those princely feet of hers².' Several times in similar circumstances his apologies were carried by Cecil, who also defended him against slander³. The change in Cecil's attitude towards him is shown in a letter from the former to the Earl of Shrewsbury (September 25, 1602):

Good Faithe, our true Friend, for so I now protest to you I cordially hold him, was about to have stolen down to you.... Well Sir, he cannot for his life get down now from the Queen, for...she will not let him go from her⁴.

¹ Salisbury MSS., ix, p. 346.

² *Ibid.*, xi, p. 246, June 22, 1601.

³ *Ibid.*, xi, p. 442.

⁴ Nichols, *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, III, p. 595.

There is no reason to doubt the writer's good faith, which is borne out by the casual manner of Greville's notes at this time.

With the death of the Queen, the poet's world fell to pieces. He could never hope to gain the same personal influence over James; he would indeed be fortunate if he escaped the loss of most of his grants and posts; from the centre of things he would be thrust out to become a hanger-on at the fringes of the Court. Of all his friends Cecil had least to fear, and knew most about the King's intentions.

Accordingly, Greville became a client of the indispensable statesman; he sought him at the Council Chamber, 'where not finding you, I like a valiant gentleman went to your privy chamber door, but could hear no news of you. How ill provided I am and ever was for heat and press you know.' So he went away disappointed and humiliated¹. Shortly afterwards, congratulating Cecil on his elevation to the peerage, he begged him to preserve his 'kindness and worth' for the sake of his dependants.

Troubles were indeed threatening, and it was well that Greville had the help of powerful friends. He wrote to Cecil in May:

I understand that by such mediation as your self and my noble friends have used for me, the King is pleased not only to stay that course of disadvantage into which I was falling, but also to grace me with some mark of more near favour. I was never 'trecher' nor unthankful man: I would not say this that I presume to write for myself, and since men that have fortune to do good must venture upon the honesty of men let me press you the rather, because as the age shapes, I know your hazard will be every way as great wheresoever you bestow your favour.

His pride revolted at the petitioner's part, but enforced by circumstance, he paid his court with a good grace:

I presume to send you some quails fed at Deptford. If the housewifery be not good, I will get a handsome wench, in hope the rather to invite my honourable friends thither, because I know it natural in all men of sweet affections and open clear eyes, to look more willingly upon such a lively creature, than any tapestry or other picture. Well sir, in earnest I shall think myself much honoured whensoever it please you to visit that poor house; and in all other things if your own sincerity make me seem unthankful it is none my fault. When God will be pleased to free me from trouble I shall be much more covetous to wait upon you and sometimes trouble your business more unmannerly².

His Welsh office was in danger and it was only through the kindness of Sir Edward Coke and Cecil that he was enabled to compound with David Foulis for a large sum which necessitated his borrowing from Michael Hicks (cf. Grosart, I, pp. lviii-lix). 'I know you affect the gentleman, and I would be glad to protect him as much as I could from suits in law,' wrote Coke to Cecil³. He remained one of the few 'noblemen allowed in the Privy Chamber⁴,' and was made Knight of the Bath at the Corona-

¹ Salisbury MSS., xv, p. 83.

² *Ibid.*, xv, pp. 96 and 128

³ *Ibid.*, xv, p. 179, July 9: cf. *Cal. S.P. Dom.* 1603-10, p. 24.

⁴ *Ibid.*, xv, July, 1603.

tion. Such gestures, however, could not recompense him for the loss of influence which accompanied them. Sir Robert Dudley brought a suit against him; Sir Robert Mansell sought a reversion in the Navy Office over his head¹, and finally obtained the Treasurership for life 'on surrender of Fulk Greville' in 1604². His tenure of Wedgnoek was assured by the good offices of Sir Edward Coke³; the grant of Warwick Castle was a slight compensation for his losses; nevertheless, it was with grievous disappointment that he withdrew more and more during the next few years into the privacy of his estates.

He was one of the greatest landowners of his day. Besides mansions at Austin Friars, Tottenham Cross, Hackney and Warwick, he held domains scattered all over the Midlands; he worked iron at Cannock Chase; and exercised a 'patent of wines.' In 1609, when he drew £1000 from his office in Wales—no longer a sinecure—his total income was over £13,000⁴. A careful landlord, he trusted much in the skill of his friend John Coke, who acted as his assistant at the Navy Office, married the daughter of his agent, and devoted himself for years to the supervision of his accounts and the management of estate affairs. After Greville's restoration, Coke had his reward; largely through the former's interest, he rose to be Secretary of State. Their correspondence is of considerable value for the light it throws on Greville's private life.

He had always been fond of children and particularly interested in the children of his sister, who had married Sir Richard Verney. 'Commend me I pray you to all the little ones,' he wrote to Coke about 1600. 'I joy in them and by my own defect know how happy their youth may be to them that are set young in a right way⁵.' In the heir, Greville Verney, he retained his interest for many years. The education of this promising boy seems to have been supervised by a number of friends including Greville, Coke, and Robert Naunton. In an undated letter to the last of these, Coke speaks highly of the lad:

You sow in a plentiful and well-tilled ground which must needs yield an abundant harvest if the heart thereof through too much heat be not smothered and spent...his body and mind should be kept in a right line both of health and strength and specially that modest alacrity of spirit which I ever loved and admired in him should in no wise be dulled with any overstrain⁶.

It was to this delicate and studious youth that Fulk Greville sent a letter of sound advice in 1609 (November 20), together with '£30 sterling

¹ Hist. MSS. Earl Cowper, I, p. 45.

² *Cal. S.P. Dom.* 1603-10, p. 98. Mansell held office, with dishonour, till 1618.

³ Hist. MSS. Earl Cowper, I, p. 51.

⁴ Cf. interesting accounts in Earl Cowper MSS., I, pp. 64-70.

⁵ Earl Cowper MSS., I, p. 28.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I, p. 38.

for your present supply,' when the former was in need on his travels. Nothing definite is known of Greville's relations with the Verneys after this date, but it seems that after his death, at least, they remembered him with no friendly feeling. On November 21, 1632, John Verney wrote to Sir John Coke asking him to delay the publication of the *Certaine learned and elegant workes* of Fulk Greville because of the inclusion of the above letter of advice in the volume:

..The beginning of it doth intimate that my brother should be of charge to my uncle. Your Honour well knows of what charge the breeding of my brother hath been to my father, and that it never cost my Lord Brooke a penny. This is some trick put upon my brother, as to possess the world with an opinion that my Lord Brooke should be at great charge with breeding my brother and so take off the charge of the world for that injury he hath otherwise done my brother.

He declared that the letter was not written to his brother but probably to 'my cousin John Harris,' and concluded:

I humbly desire that, because it toucheth my father and my brother, they may be stopped coming out till I make my brother acquainted with it, and that you may see the truth of this¹.

Coke may have delayed publication, but the letter was not removed from Greville's works; hence we may infer that Sir Greville Verney admitted having received it. His brother's complaint suggests that money matters were involved in the supposed injuries done to the family by their relative. We know that both Verney brothers were expected to benefit by his death (cf. *infra*, Lord Brudenell to Earl of Westmorland); perhaps they did not benefit so much as they hoped. Maybe they regarded his behaviour in leaving the mass of his property to his heir Robert (a distant relative whom he had adopted in 1612) as a betrayal of his former favourite, and nephew.

During his retirement Greville occupied himself with study and literary work, writing *Mustapha* and enlarging or revising the verse treatises which grew out of his tragic choruses. Discussion of these would require separate treatment. External evidence of his intellectual activity is scanty; but two letters of 1610 have interest. In one, the young Earl of Essex advises Greville as to the best means of using secretarial assistance in taking notes of books²; in the other Naunton informs Coke that Greville has gone to Cambridge to 'repair his own health which the unseasonable winter together with the restless working of his own thoughts hath much distempered³.' It was apparently quite early in the reign of James that he approached Cecil with the request (as he tells in

¹ Earl Cowper MSS., I, p. 483. Cf. *Times Lit. Suppl.*, Oct. 15, 1931, p. 802.

² *Cal. S.P. Dom.* 1603-10, p. 656.

³ Earl Cowper MSS., I, p. 68, February 28, 1609-10.

Sidney, pp. 215–20) that he be allowed access to State documents for a projected life of Elizabeth. This matter was probably one cause of their alienation; yet, although Greville took offence at Cecil's conduct, one cannot but feel, on reading even his account, that the Secretary behaved amiably and prudently. 'At first,' says Fulk Greville,

my abrupt motion tooke hold of his present Counsell. For he liberally granted my request, and appointed me that day three weeks to come for his warrant, which I did, and then found in shew a more familiar, and gracefull aspect then before, he descending to question me, why I would dreame out my time in writing a story, being as like to rise in this time as any man he knew; then in a more serious and friendly manner examining me, how I would cleerly delhver many things done in that time, which might perchance be construed to the prejudice.

On Greville's replying that he would sift his material and take the responsibility of eliminating any doubtful matter,

immediately this Noble Secretary, as it seems, moved, but not removed, with those selfnesses of my opinion, seriously assured me, that upon second thoughts he durst not presume to let the Councell-chest be open to any man living, without his Majesties knowledge and approbation. (Pp. 218–19.)

This final refusal was so inevitable in the political circumstances that we marvel that Cecil's desire to please Greville had caused him to forget his duty in the first instance. But it crushed Greville's hopes. Unwilling to submit to a censorship by which 'the worke itselfe would have proved a story of other men's writing with my name only to put to it,' he withdrew in resentment.

Nevertheless, because his ambition was not merely to 'dreame out his time,' he remained Salisbury's suitor, albeit sadly and humbly. Complimenting the latter on the prevention of a plot against his life (July 12, 1606), he declared, 'I can offer your lordship no more than his humble service that it seemes is as unfortunate as they that wish him worst would have him¹.' In 1607, he 'keeps watch upon your going and coming as the poor mariner upon the star which he finds most propitious to him²'; from Wedgnoock in August, 1610, he sends a stag of his own breeding and killing. All without tangible effect; Greville remained in the wilderness until the great man's death in May, 1612. When that occurred, the pliant courtier was ready:

Sir Fulk Grevil begins to appear upon the stage for a Secretary; he haunts Pithias' threshold before day, and though Northampton and he speak ill one of the other, this Nicodemus yet visiteth him also at midnight, which shews Rochester must charge, and Suffolk will second. Nevertheless I think Northampton will be Treasurer, and Grevil will not be Secretary³.

¹ Grosart (I, pp. lxi–lxii) thought this letter referred to the Gunpowder Plot. R. Naunton wrote on July 11 that Father Baldwin was 'discovered to have practised a young English convert to despatch the Earl of Sarum.' Cf. Earl Cowper MSS., I, p. 62.

² *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1607, p. 373, September 30.

³ Portland MSS., IX, pp. 37–9. Sir J. Holles to J. Digby.

This letter of Sir John Holles shows the direction of Greville's new allegiance; towards Robert Carr, Earl of Rochester, the King's favourite, and Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton. The former was the lover, the latter a kinsman, of the infamous Frances Howard, wife of Robert, Earl of Essex. Greville's friendship for the son of his old patron did not prevent his attaching himself to Rochester's party. After the annulment of the Essex marriage, he attended the nuptials of the adulterers and presented a cup of gold to the happy pair. His complaisance had its reward in October, 1614, when, at the age of sixty, Sir Fulk Greville became Chancellor and Under Treasurer of the Exchequer. Next year, when Rochester (now Somerset) fell from power, Greville sat on the first commission of inquiry into the Overbury murder.

The return to office of one so long in private life surprised many about the Court. Holles wrote to his friend Lakes:

How comes it about that I hear of my Lord Knolles Master of the Wards and a Sir Fulk Grevill Chancellor of the Exchequer, and nothing of Sir Thomas Lakes? The parable in the Gospel giveth as great hire to him that came the last as he that came the first hour, but I never read nor heard that he that wrought not at all in the vineyard had anything at all from the lord of the vineyard but was shut forth with the foolish virgins. From the 24 of March 1603 you have been a continual and painfull labourer¹. while Sir Fulk Grevill lived at Warwick or Hackney, served only himself, and his own affections, and grew rich. It is true he walked sometimes in Whitehall Galleries where peradventure he found a readier way to preferment. I confess he hath great parts, and if the king had sooner taken to him, sooner had his service been found useful; but then was he conceived to be a vessel of wrath. Some had told tales of the Lady in the Tower and of Councils held at Rufford and other places. Let this notwithstanding pass with the rest as one of our new *arcana imperii*, by which none ought to despair, be his merit never so bad...².

This important letter may help to solve the mystery of Greville's long deprivation of office. For the 'Lady in the Tower' was Arabella Stuart, first cousin of James who feared her shadowy title to the throne after the Main Plot of 1604 in which many thought her to have been an innocent centre of conspiracy. Alternately in favour and under suspicion, she was at last, in 1610, placed in confinement on the discovery of her secret marriage to her old lover the Tudor William Seymour. Recaptured after a thrilling escape, she was sent to the Tower where she died more or less insane in 1615. No direct intercourse between Greville and the unhappy lady is traceable; knowing his caution we may assume that any association he had with her was as innocent as his dealings with another prisoner, the Earl of Northumberland—to whom he lent his gardener². Mistrust was, however, aroused, nor is the reason far to seek.

¹ Portland MSS., ix, p. 142.

² Hist. MSS. 6th Report, Appendix, p. 230 Percy's accounts for the year 1610–11, February, include payment of two shillings to Sir F. Grevill's gardener.

Rufford was one of the mansions of Gilbert, Earl of Shrewsbury, Arabella's uncle. Under Elizabeth, his mother, the harsh and scheming Dowager Countess, had charge of the girl, but was deprived of her guardianship on the accession of James, who disliked her. Gilbert's wife, also ambitious, connived at her niece's marriage and flight, and, being regarded as the sole contriver of the latter's 'bedlam opposition,' was lodged in the Tower, where her contumacious silence caused her detention until shortly before her husband's death in 1616. The Earl took no part in the Arabella affair, having always advised her to be patient. Passive as his friend Salisbury, he signed in Council the orders affecting her liberty, and lost little of the King's favour. Greville apparently was rather less discreet.

His friendship with the Shrewsburys was ancient and warm. In 1602, when disposing of the treasures captured in a carrack, he wrote to the Countess:

Among the goods there is little delicacies worthy of you, but if I might understand your Ladships pleasure, I would gladly do you service in it: The kinds be calicoes; sleved silks; all manner of spices, but nutmegs and sugar; gemmes, rich, and store; carpets, the Queen hath stayd all, neyther is there any halfe comparable to yo^r old one; damaskes, very few; ebony wood, abundance; and this is the summe: Be pleased noble lady, to comand me as you please

In the same letter, with his aristocratic prejudices in revolt, he bids her beware, for 'one Swinnerton, a merchant,' is trying to buy some property of the Marquis of Winchester of which the Countess, the Lady Warwick, and he himself, are tenants; 'we your poore neighebers, would thincke our dwellings desolate without you, and conceive your Ladshipec would not willingly become a tenant to suche a fellow¹.' The continuance of this intimacy contributed to the political eclipse of Greville during the years in which Arabella Stuart remained a menace to James. With Cecil dead and Arabella mentally deranged in prison, the obstacles to the poet's promotion were removed. Once raised to high office, he never lost the ear of the ruling favourite, and so was enabled to pass the remainder of his active life in useful and responsible employment.

He retained his seat on the Council of the Marches, being excused regular attendance in 1617. In that year, he was spoken of as likely to succeed Winwood as Secretary; but Buckingham gave the post to Naunton². Deputed with Lord Carew to report on the matrimonial tangles of Sir Edward Coke and his wife, he managed to bring about a temporary reconciliation, 'although before the Council they accused one

¹ E. Lodge, *Illustrations*, III, pp. 151-2.

² *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, October 13, 1617. Sir Edward Cecil to Carleton, p. 492.

another in a grievous manner¹. He devoted much time and trouble to the enclosure of new land for the King's parks at Theobald's and elsewhere, encountering much opposition from the occupiers, and showing some dislike of the task and its extravagance. When Theobald's is ready, he writes, 'The King will find that he pays like a King for his pleasure².' Although rumour in 1618 ran that he was about to be made a baron, it was not until late in 1621 that he entered the Lords. The next year saw his retirement from the Exchequer; he remained a Privy Councillor, however, and wrote to Buckingham letters of advice on the Palatinate and the Spanish Marriage, showing in the latter instance a puerile gaiety of address which accords ill with the wisdom of his counsel³. He sat on the Councils of War and Foreign Affairs.

Brought in contact, as Under Treasurer, with the economic and commercial problems of the age, Greville had renewed his interest in the East India Company. When, as a result of serious disputes with the Dutch Company, a commission representing both countries met in London in 1619, he was a member. On the attainment of an agreement, Chamberlain wrote to Carleton on July 31, that, together with other commissioners,

Lord Digby and Sir Foulke Greville had each a basin and ewer of gold, of the value of 300£ from the States, and a chain of gold of the like value, from the English East India Company.

In 1621-2 he sat on another committee of inquiry; and as a shareholder he attended the Company's meetings after he relinquished office. The Court Minutes of September 20, 1624, note 'Requests of Sir Francis Crane and Lord Brooke that, in respect they have extraordinary use of silk for their tapestry they may take out their seventh and eighth capitals in silk.' The requests were not granted⁴.

His experience in the Navy Office, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and as man of business, gave him almost unrivalled opportunities of insight into both the internal and the international aspects of contemporary trade and finance; it is remarkable, therefore, that his treatise on *Commerce*, like those on *Monarchy* and *Religion*, should have been completely neglected by historians of the period.

Despite failing health ('Age and sickness (the gentlemen ushers of death) had imprisoned him for a while' in 1625), he remained at Court after the accession of Charles I, helping Buckingham to form 'a noble household' for the King's satisfaction, so as not to 'exclude his father's

¹ *Cal. S.P. Dom.* 1617, p. 469.

² *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, April 20, 22, May 15; June 2, July 14, 1617.

³ Cf. Grosart, I, pp. lxxv-lxxvii.

⁴ For East India Company references, cf. *Cal. S.P. Col. E. Indies*, 1617-21, p. 239; 1622-4, p. 409; etc.

old servants or abandon his own¹, and sitting under Buckingham on the Committee for Foreign Affairs. At the beginning of 1627 he obtained a new sinecure, as Deputy Vice-Admiral for the Isle of Wight.

In these last years of his life Greville revived an old project, which was to do honour to scholarship and to his own name by the foundation of a history lectureship at Cambridge. The following notes throw light on this matter, which puzzled Grosart and Sir Sidney Lee.

In 1615, when newly appointed Chancellor, he had gone so far as provisionally to summon to England a candidate for an

intended lecture of story notwithstanding the invitements carried in such a manner by contract before he came as 100 marks in reward dischargeth all sides from imputation....By nation he is a Northern Breton, by 10 or 12 years education a German, 35 years old, industrious, of a good presence and so much less able to satisfy the envy which his foreign birth may perhaps stir up against him. For the forepart of his head rich inside to the back side I am yet a stranger in all things but books².

We hear nothing more of the proposal until 1624, when he began to make new arrangements and invited Vossius to come over from Leyden. Negotiations between them continued for three years, Carleton, William Boswell and others taking part³; but, chiefly for domestic reasons, Vossius never came, and expressed pleasure when, in 1627, Greville sent another invitation to Isaac Dorislaus, also of Leyden, who had lived in England. Appointed as from May, 1627, Dorislaus went to Cambridge 'with his Majesty's letters to assign him a school and to read a history lecture on the *Annals* of Tacitus.' His patron soon had cause to regret his generosity, for, as Dr Matthew Wren wrote in December to Laud:

His first lecture passed unexcepted at, but I warned the Heads in private that the lecturer placed the right of monarchy in the people's voluntary submission. The second lecture contained such dangerous passages, and so applicable to the exasperations of these villainous times, that I could not abstain before the Heads from taking offence.

Wren therefore declined to incorporate Dorislaus as a Doctor of Cambridge, but described him as 'of good bearing, very ingenuous, and ready to give satisfaction in any kind⁴.' Further light is thrown on the affair by a letter from Dr Samuel Ward to Bishop Ussher, May 16, 1628:

I suppose you have heard of a Lecture for reading of History intended to be given us by the Lord Brook, who as you know first intended to have had Mr. Vossius of Leyden; afterwards his Stipend being augmented by the States, he resolved of Dr. Dorislaus of Leyden also....

Ward then tells in more detail the trouble caused by the lecturer's

¹ *Cal. S.P. Venice and N. Italy*, xix, 1625-6, p. 21; Pesaro to Doge and Senate.

² Earl Cowper MSS., i, pp. 89-90, with Coke's reply.

³ Cf. *Gerardi Joan. Vossii et Clarorum Virorum ad eum Epistolæ*, 1690.

⁴ Cf. *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1627-8, pp. 470, 546, 627.

democratic views, pointing out that the latter's remarks did not apply to England,

yet the Master of *Peterhouse* complained to the Vice-Chancellor, Master of *Christ's* Colledg; and complaint also was made above, and it came to his Majesty's ear.

Dorislau, who was personally very popular, made a satisfactory explanation,

whereupon letters were written to his Patron, to the Bishop of *Durham*, and others, to signify so much. But he going to his Patron, first he suppressed the Letters, and said, he would see an Accuser before any excuse should be made. After word came from the Bishop of *Winchester*, then *Durham*, in his Majesty's Name, to prohibit the History-Reader to read. But after that, both his Majesty, and the Bishop, and all others above, and here, were satisfied, but then his Patron kept off, and doth to this day, and will allow his Reader the Stipend for his time; but we fear we shall lose the lecture. I see a Letter which his Patron writ to him, to Malden, to will him to be gone into his Country; but he would assure him of his Stipend. The Doctor kept with me, while he was in Town. He married an English Woman about *Malden* in *Essex*, where he now is. He is a fair-conditioned Man, and a good Scholar¹.

After Greville's death in October, 1628, Dorislau applied to his executor, Sir John Coke, for maintenance, only to find himself without legal standing ('men of prudence consider me to have been wrong in that which I thought had been duly provided for me²'). Greville's will referred to the lectureship only in a codicil which was contested by his heir. 'It appears doubtful whether it could be made sure without an Act of Parliament,' wrote Dr Henry Butt, Vice-Chancellor of the University, in an effort to preserve the gift; 'if it may be done by decree of Chancery we shall be right glad, otherwise it were much to the honour of the Lord Brooke that now is to found it anew himself³.'

Apparently the decree was not forthcoming, nor did Greville's heir wish to complete the foundation. The lectureship accordingly lapsed after this brief and unfortunate life. Greville's conduct was characteristic. Himself strongly Protestant and anti-absolutist in his heart of hearts, he chose a democratic Dutch scholar as his ideal historian. But cautious and timid as ever in his public behaviour, fearing the bad opinions that the views of 'his domestic' might bring upon him, he showed himself more censorious than the King himself, repudiated and dismissed the lecturer (though with compensation), and neglected to make adequate provision for the perpetuation of an office which had caused him little but disappointment.

The full truth about Greville's death may never be known. Coming as it did soon after the assassination of Buckingham, it was obscured by

¹ Cf. Parr's *Life of Ussher*, 1686, pp. 393-4.

² Earl Cowper MSS., i, p. 370.

³ *Ibid.*, i, pp. 427, 449.

the more important and sensational occurrence, while the prompt suicide of his murderer left its motive permanently in doubt. Contemporary gossip and lampoon ascribed it to his meanness, declaring that his old servant Ralph Haywood stabbed him in a frenzy caused by his master's refusal to mention him in his will. More recent writers have tried to defend Brooke by arguing from his other acts of generosity, his kindness to literary dependents, his munificence to the doctors who attended him on his deathbed. But this by itself would not be good evidence; a man may be generous enough on some occasions, yet ungrateful on others; philanthropists have been known to be stingy towards their own servants. There may have been some truth in the accusations of general parsimony brought against Greville, although they may have had no other basis than his success in piling up possessions by political means, and the careful husbandry in managing them to which the Coke letters attest. In the particular matter of his servant, however, the poet now seems to have been blameless, at least with regard to the main charge.

Of the several accounts of the affair the most circumstantial and the most trustworthy is that by Edward Reed, who had long known Brooke, and visited him just after the attack. Brooke was stabbed on September 1, 1628; on September 2, Reed, whose custom it was to send news to Sir John Coke in the latter's absence from town, wrote as follows:

My Lord Brooke being upon Saturday come to town and resolving to go down this day for Warwickshire was arrested here by his servant Ralph Haywood, who trussing his points stabbed him into two places in the left side, the upper blow is between the lower ribs and next the back (perhaps mortal): the second and lower blow is but a flesh wound and the cure not doubted. When Haywood had wounded him, being alone with him in his chamber, he ran from him, left him bleeding, and locked him in with a double lock, and ran himself into his own chamber which he locked also, opened his doublet and with the same knife gave himself four wounds into his breast, upon which he presently died. My Lord Brooke calling loud, Mr Wilson came unto him, and with his double key opened the door, found him bleeding but not any whit amazed, neither did he desire that if Haywood were escaped out of the house that he should be prosecuted, desiring not that any man should lose his life for him. After I heard of his hurt I went to see him, and found him to speak heartily, and not any whit to be troubled with the danger, but much with the pain. This morning my Lord's wounds are to be opened again, upon which the surgeons think to give some guess of the state of him. My Lord had given Haywood 20*l.* a year for his life now at his coming from Warwick¹.

* The last sentence suggests that Greville had not behaved ungenerously to his murderer. If he refused to leave Haywood a legacy, it was because he had already arranged to provide him with an annuity. If the man demanded more, and, being denied, killed his master in a fit of insanity, it is not the latter whom we should accuse of greed.

But in old age as in youth Greville had enemies willing to think the

¹ Earl Cowper MSS., i, p. 365.

worst of him. Thus Lord Brudenell wrote to the Earl of Westmorland on October 2:

My Lord Brooke dyed of corrupted fatt thrust into the wound of his belly in place of his kell, which putrefying ended him, that fewer sorrowes then the D [i.e. than for the Duke of Buckingham], though not so many rejoyces. Some of his old inheritance fall to Sir Grivell Verney his nephew, but Warwick Castell his honnor and the greatest part of his estate to one Sir Fulk Grivell, his great uncle's grandchild, his office to Sir Grivell Verney's next brother, and he himself descended as is conjectured¹.

Greville had outlived his peers; at the Court of Charles I he must have seemed a survival from another age. Yet it was not this, but a certain ambiguous quality in his character which probably aroused suspicions of his honesty in old age as in youth. We like a man to be forthright, but in him there appeared to be a strain of duplicity; he talked Senecan stoicism while ardently seeking places; he combined a 'sound' Protestant view of religion with an almost Machiavellian opportunism.

Inevitably Greville remained an enigma. Equipped with an intellect of the first order, he was not content with things of the mind, but wasted his spirit in the world of action. He had more in common with Bacon than with any other of his contemporaries. Their friendship under the aegis of Essex, and Greville's (somewhat diffident) support of Bacon in later troubles, were the results of a natural affinity. It is not by coincidence that the *Treatise of Humane Learning* has some arguments in common with the *Advancement*. Both men came to realise the necessity in mundane matters of an empirical attitude; both learned much from the pragmatism of *The Prince*. But here they parted. Whereas Bacon, the more forceful and active in mind, readily accepted the inevitable conditions of public life, and rarely looked beyond, Greville suffered them under protest and never ceased to yearn for the ideal world in which his friend Philip had lived so easily. Empiricism, Machiavellianism, were merely makeshifts. The elect of God would be above the world. But Greville was not sure that he was one of the elect; and the world was too much with him.

He wrote only for those on whom 'the Black Oxen' had trod, since only those who had given themselves to the sick hurry, the divided aims of the world and yet remained sadly aware of a higher reality could appreciate the truth of his 'double' view of life, and the subtlety with which he tempered relativism in politics and morality with an apprehension of something nobler, that he was, however, too unheroic to

¹ Rutland MSS., i, p. 487. Greville's title and estates passed to Robert, the son of his cousin Fulk. The office referred to was the Welsh secretaryship, the reversion of which had been shared by John Verney for some years.

pursue. Man cannot serve two masters—and be happy; though the dilemma was magnificently ignored by many in the earlier Renaissance, it was increasingly recognised as ineluctable in the age of Donne. Donne himself, after temporising for years, finally ‘clutched at God’s skirts’ and was swept up into the cloud from which he preached like an angel. Not for Fulk Greville this valiant self-surrender. Always he tried to serve both God and Mammon. It was ironically fitting that Mammon should kill him.

G. BULLOUGH.

EDINBURGH.

SHAKESPEARE'S IMITATORS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

THE imitation of Shakespeare in the eighteenth century is a subject that has been generally neglected by his critics and his bibliographers. Much has been written about the numerous adaptations of his plays by such men as Tate, Cibber, and Aaron Hill, but the actual attempts made in the eighteenth century to write in imitation of Shakespeare's style have provoked little comment from modern scholarship. Yet, quite apart from the parodies and travesties (which are not very numerous, and are almost always deplorably childish), professed attempts by eighteenth-century authors to write in the manner of Shakespeare—to write, that is to say, a play, and occasionally a poem, in a style which was unlike that of the eighteenth century, and which the writer hoped was Shakespearean—are sufficiently numerous to merit more attention than has hitherto been paid to them.

Shakespeare's influence on the language of such poets as Gray and Blair is well known. Gray, for instance, replying to a letter from his friend West about the fragment of *Agrippina*¹, reproaches himself for condescending to such phrases as 'silken son of dalliance' and 'wrinkled beldams,' which he attributes to his fondness for Shakespeare. Similarly he finds 'a tang of Shakespear' in the language of Mason's *Elfrida*²; and David Hume deplores the fact that his young kinsman, John Home, who had written a tragedy called *Agis*, had been corrupting his taste by imitating Shakespeare too much in his play³. But such imitation as may be found in Gray or Mason or Home is only occasional, and amounts to little more than a faint and cautious echoing of remembered phrases in a favourite author. There are, however, a number of sustained and professed imitations of Shakespeare in the eighteenth century, in which the author owns that 'he had the mighty Bard in View'⁴ throughout; and however negligible these may be as literature or drama, and however wide of the mark as imitations of their author, they certainly throw a good deal of light on the eighteenth-century's attitude to Shakespeare.

It was an age, of course, in which literary imitation flourished—an infallible sign, perhaps, of the feeble and secondary nature of so much of

¹ *The Correspondence of Gray, Walpole, West and Ashton*, ed. Toynbee, II, p. 28.

² *Ibid.*, p. 106.

³ *Life and Correspondence of David Hume*, ed. J. H. Burton, I, p. 392.

⁴ Prologue to Rowe's *Jane Shore* (1714).

22 *Shakespeare's Imitators in the Eighteenth Century*

its inspiration, but also a proof of its interest in the older writers. To write 'in the manner of' Chaucer, or Spenser, or Milton was one of the main verse exercises of the period. Some of the imitators were serious enough in their intentions, others were merely looking for an excuse to write facetiously; some began seriously and ran into burlesque, others set out in a flippant spirit and turned serious as the author became more and more fascinated by his model. Imitations of Chaucer were popular because they gave the author an easy chance of writing ludicrously; Milton's style was a favourite one for mock heroics. Spenser certainly had a number of sincere admirers in the eighteenth century, but he, too, was frequently burlesqued. When, however, we come to examine the treatment of Shakespeare by his eighteenth-century imitators, we find two rather surprising things: the attempts to imitate him are comparatively few, and, secondly, there is little effort at parody and burlesque. There must be some explanation of those two facts.

In the first place, Shakespeare is not an easy writer to imitate seriously, nor even, unless the writer is very easily satisfied, to imitate comically. Imitating Spenser is a much simpler business; for there you have several factors to help you. Spenser wrote what was quite definitely a literary language; a great part of his peculiar charm comes from his use of quaint and archaic terms, and those can be reproduced or imitated. The characteristic drowsy rhythm of the Spenserian stanza is something that only Spenser himself could manage quite perfectly; but it is in the power of any reasonably competent metrist at least to suggest it. Something may be done, too, by way of odd spellings and an occasional word-coining to encourage a charitable reader to accept your imitation of Spenser as something which is at least recognisable. But the imitator of Shakespeare has almost none of those small aids to plausibility. Compared with Spenser, Shakespeare is a writer with almost no manner at all. When a line or passage is unmistakably Shakespearean, it is rather because no other known writer could possibly have written it than that it has some rhythm or mannerism that can be set down as characteristic. Every line of Shakespeare is thoroughly Shakespearean, but in a different way. The impression is not so much that Shakespeare is putting things in one characteristic manner as that the words themselves are striding along by the shortest possible way to the end in sight. With other writers, there appears to be a longer interval between the idea and its expression—if one may be permitted to separate the two for the purposes of this distinction. With Spenser one can almost speak of the expression being ready for the idea before it arrives, and then, when it does arrive, pro-

ceeding to take charge of it, and polish it, until it shines with the same equal light as everything else in the stanza and the canto. This, of course, is to state the distinction too absolutely; yet no one, perhaps, will dispute that many writers do develop a manner far more definite and consistent than Shakespeare's. 'It has not wit enough to keep it sweet,' Dr Johnson once remarked of *The Rehearsal*; and then, recollecting himself, 'It has not vitality enough to preserve it from putrefaction.' A writer of this sort is easily imitated, because, in a sense, he is always imitating himself. But one of the most remarkable features of Shakespeare's style is just the way in which every idea seems to strike out its own individual path to its proper expression. It is true, of course, that Shakespeare's style varies largely from play to play, and that the reader of average sensitiveness can feel that *Twelfth Night* has a manner of its own very different from that of *The Tempest*; but that hardly makes matters easier for the imitator of Shakespeare, it only complicates his difficulties. It is not, perhaps, very hard to produce a tolerable imitation of the early Shakespeare, and more particularly of his comic dialogue, where his style was still marked by a number of mannerisms, but to imitate successfully the Shakespeare of *Lear* or *Hamlet* one would require an almost equal power and hurry of thought, and a corresponding gift of expression—in which case one might be better employed than in mere imitation. Shakespeare, then, was protected from the imitators by the fact that there was almost nothing external—no tricks of style, no set manner, no favourite words, no fixed rhythm—that they could lay their hands upon. If they were to follow him successfully, they would have to think and feel as he did, and with the same intensity; and that was asking too much of an imitator.

A further consideration that must have hindered eighteenth-century dramatists was the fact that their plays, even when they were imitations of Shakespeare, had to take their chance before the general, and, in the main, ignorant public. This public must be borne in mind, too, when one is judging of the success or failure of eighteenth-century imitations. The dramatist who went too far with his imitation would never see his play acted. By 1700 Shakespeare's language was already beginning to look uncouth; sometimes, indeed, it was quite unintelligible. It might be very well to imitate him in a poem; for your poem would be read by a moderately intelligent and cultured public, who could at least understand, even if they did not particularly appreciate, your attempt to reproduce the language and idiom of the older writer. But a play had to take its chance before a very mixed audience—including the footmen in the upper gallery—and there was no sense in obscuring the meaning by using words

which would not be generally understood. Writing in 1718, Gildon has to record that 'the inimitable Shakespear' is being 'rejected by some Modern Collectors for his Obsolete Language¹.' In 1742 West discusses with Gray the use of archaic terms in poetry. He is prepared to admit them occasionally: they are useful—surely a significant reason—for comic effects 'But now comes my opinion that they ought to be used in Tragedy more sparingly, than in most kinds of poetry. Tragedy is designed for public representation, and what is designed for that should certainly be most intelligible. I believe half the audience that come to Shakespear's plays do not understand the half of what they hear².' When it is remembered that they generally heard their Shakespeare in eighteenth-century versions that were partially modernised, the significance of West's warning becomes even more obvious. There is a story about the actor Quin, who had been playing for many years what he believed to be Shakespeare. He was listening one day to Garrick acting *Macbeth* in its original, and not its eighteenth-century, form; and after the performance was over he asked Garrick where he got such strange and out-of-the-way expressions as

The devil damn thee black, thou cream-faced loon,
Where got'st thou that goose look?

This was apparently the first that Quin had heard of the cream-faced loon³. There was, therefore, the real danger of imitating Shakespeare so successfully that you rendered your play unintelligible to many of the audience. If you were to risk imitating him at all, you would do so carefully; you would write what was still essentially an eighteenth-century play, though you might give it an archaic appearance by keeping Shakespeare at the back of your mind.

This, however, obviously leaves much still to be explained: there were few imitations of Shakespeare by the poets, let alone the dramatists. And here one must take into account another fact: the eighteenth century genuinely admired Shakespeare, but it was rarely on account of his language. They admired his character drawing, his treatment of the passions, his rough majestic force, but rarely his language. Gray certainly did; but in this, as in some other things, he was an exception. The general opinion was that Shakespeare had the misfortune to live in a semi-barbarous age before the language had been sufficiently refined. He was a rude old artist, blundering occasionally into grand thoughts, but never to be trusted, and frequently, in his irregularities and wild expressions,

¹ *The Complete Art of Poetry*, 1718. *The Advertisement*.

² *The Correspondence of Gray, Walpole, West and Ashton*, II, p. 32.

³ T. Davies, *Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick*, I, pp. 123-4.

to be deplored. It was a kindness to save him from himself; the Tates, the Cibbers, the Aaron Hills who produced adaptations of his plays usually did so from the best of motives. Shakespeare was his own worst enemy; he had to be polished and put in order if he was to appeal to a politer age¹. The idea of imitating his language—one of his most serious defects—was to many critics quite absurd. A writer of 1714, discussing Rowe's *Jane Shore*, did not mince matters. 'I think it so far from a Recommendation, that it is written in the Stile of *Shakespeare*, that it ought to damn it; *Ennius* and *Lucretius* were very much admir'd by the *Romans*, but it never came into the Head of *Virgil*, *Horace*, *Ovid*, *Tibullus*, or the rest, to write in imitation of the Stile of either of these Poets; the best Stile is that which arrives to the Perfection of the Language then in Being, such as is that of *Cato*, which is the best Standard of Dramatic Diction which we have in our Tongue².' West also believed that the style of *Cato* was the best for a modern tragedy; and he further told Gray if Shakespeare himself were writing to-day he would write in a different style from what he did³. What this might have meant to West and his contemporaries we may guess from some verses of William Hamilton of Bangour, who undertook to polish the rough ore of a passage in *King Lear*. Lear is addressing Edgar: 'Thou owest the worm no silk, the beast no hide, the sheep no wool, the cat no perfume....' This becomes in Hamilton:

For thee, the skilful worm, of specious hue,
No shining threads of ductile radiance drew;
For thee no sun the rip'ning gem refin'd;
No bleating innocence the fleece resign'd:
The hand of luxury ne'er taught to pour
O'er thy faunt limbs, the oil's refreshing show'r...⁴.

Similarly, James Beattie undertook to polish up 'Blow, blow, thou winter wind' into

Blow, blow, thou vernal gale!
Thy balm will not avail
To ease my aching breast...⁵.

The fact is that Shakespeare succeeded in pleasing the eighteenth century *in spite of* his language, and therefore we need not be surprised to find his imitators not attempting very earnestly to reproduce his peculiar mode of expression. When they did, they were as often as not

¹ Cf. the prologue to Aaron Hill's *King Henry V*:
From Wit's old Ruins, shadow'd o'er with Bays,
We draw some rich remains of Shakespeare's praise.

² *A New Rehearsal, Or Bays the Younger*, 1714, p. 77.

³ *The Correspondence of Gray, Walpole, West and Ashton*, II, p. 23.

⁴ *Poems on Several Occasions*, 1760 (Edinburgh), p. 210.

⁵ James Beattie, *Original Poems and Translations*, 1760, p. 74.

condemned for it. The anonymous critic of 1714 was not alone in condemning Rowe's attempt to imitate Shakespeare's style in his *Jane Shore*. Pope, who was a friend of Rowe's, and who was speaking without the least malice, stated years afterwards what he thought of the attempt: 'It was mighty simple in Rowe, to write a play now, professedly in Shakespeare's style, that is, professedly in the style of a bad age¹.'

'In the style of a bad age': the words are suggestive of the attitude of the Augustans to the age of Shakespeare. Pope, in fact, refers to it as we might refer to Victorian furniture or architecture—'in the style of a bad age.' To us Shakespeare is an Elizabethan, a dramatist no less than three hundred years away; to Pope and his contemporaries he must have appeared something of a Victorian. It is true that the linguistic changes between 1600 and 1700 were more considerable than those from 1800 to the present day; but that perhaps only intensified the feeling at the beginning of the eighteenth century that Shakespeare was definitely old-fashioned. The frequency of allusion in prologue and epilogue to 'old Shakespear' will indicate the half-affectionate, half-condescending attitude which the thoroughly up-to-date dramatist of 1700 would assume towards this rather antiquated writer. Perhaps no generation has ever been more consciously modern than that which opened the eighteenth century. Time and again one can see how intensely up-to-date it felt itself to be, and, of course, was. The fact that so many people still find the Victorian age rather unpleasant to contemplate should warn us against too hasty a judgment of the Queen Anne wits when they show a certain impatience with our immortal Shakespeare. In 1700 his immortality was still young; he was no more, in fact, than 'old Shakespear,' and there were people still walking the streets who had been born before he died. In 1700, if you were looking for someone quaint to imitate or parody, you would much more naturally turn to Chaucer, or, if he was too hard for you, then to Spenser.

There is one final reason why Shakespeare was so little imitated in the eighteenth century; it should be remembered that the contemporaries of Addison and of Johnson had very definite ideas as to what a play should be. Even if the matter of language be left out of account, there were other features of Shakespeare's plays—the disregard of the unities, the lack of love scenes in most of the tragedies, the mixture of comedy with tragedy, and so on—which offended the eighteenth-century purist. Shakespeare himself might be forgiven, but a modern writer need not think to ride off on the plea that what Shakespeare had done must

¹ *Spence's Anecdotes*, ed. Singer, 1820, p. 174.

necessarily be permissible for others. The prologue to Jephson's *Law of Lombardy* (1779), itself a play with some traces of the older drama¹, puts the matter quite firmly:

Nor let presumptuous poets fondly claim
From rules exemption, by great Shakespeare's name;
Though comets move with wild excentric force,
Yet humbler planets keep their stated course.

When Colley Cibber rewrote *King John* for his own generation, he saw nothing presumptuous in explaining in his dedication, 'I have endeavour'd to make it more like a play than what I found it in Shakespeare.' To the eighteenth century he had certainly succeeded in doing so.

The first, and in some ways the most notable, of Shakespeare's eighteenth-century imitators was Nicholas Rowe. In 1712 the facetious William King had published *The Tragi-Comedy of Joan of Hedington. In Imitation of Shakespear*²; but this play was pure burlesque, and may, indeed, have been written with the purpose of ridiculing Rowe's *Jane Shore*, which the Town was probably by this time expecting. From the first Rowe had shown an interest in the earlier drama; he had, for instance, found the plot for his third play in Massinger's *Fatal Dowry*, and had actually projected an edition of that dramatist³. Not only that, but he upset the critics by introducing archaic words and odd, old-fashioned expressions into his own plays. 'My Soul is come within the ken of Heav'n,' he had written in *Tamerlane*. 'Ken,' he was told by one of his critics, 'is too *Scottish* and familiar for Tragedy⁴.' He was censured, too, for his irregularity and his disregard of dramatic rules. Rowe, in fact, had turned back to the Elizabethans, consciously or unconsciously, for much of his inspiration. It was not, however, until *The Tragedy of Jane Shore. Written in Imitation of Shakespear's Style* (1714) that he openly claimed to be imitating Shakespeare. It was perhaps the prestige that his edition of 1709 had given him that emboldened Rowe to try his startling experiment on the Town; for it was undoubtedly a daring thing to do in that age of correctness. *Jane Shore* ran for fifteen nights, however, between February 2 and 25—a run which was very nearly a record for the theatre of Queen Anne—and it became one of the stock tragedies of the eighteenth century. Of all the imitations of Shakespeare it is certainly the best piece of drama. But had it any merit as an imitation? Not to the critics. Pope, for instance, could see no resemblance. 'I have seen a play professedly

¹ The prologue describes the author as coming 'warm from Shakespeare's school.'

² Published in *Useful Miscellanies*, 1712.

³ *The Bondman*, 1719. *The Bookseller to the Reader*.

⁴ *A Comparison between the Two Stages*, 1702, pp. 187-8.

writ in the style of Shakespear; wherein the resemblance lay in one single line,

And so good morrow t'ye, good master Lieutenant¹.

The critic is being a little unjust here, and in consequence he has managed to make two slips: he has misquoted the line, and it is not from *Jane Shore* at all, but from Rowe's last play, *Lady Jane Gray*.

But Rowe's claim to be imitating Shakespeare is not quite so absurd as Pope makes out. Here and there, for example, there are such obvious echoes as

And the long Train of Frailties Flesh is Heir to,

and there is one whole scene, where Gloster gives orders for the death of Hastings, which keeps very close to Shakespeare. As might be expected, he relies too much for his Elizabethan atmosphere upon tags like 'Beshrew my heart!' and 'Soft ye, now,' and upon obsolete words like 'resty' and 'hilding.' Once or twice he descends so low as 'Avaunt, base groom!' But Rowe had undoubtedly learnt something from his editing—Shakespeare's profusion of metaphor, his habit of cumulative description, his fondness for coining words. 'Thus to coy it!' is the exclamation of Hastings when Jane repulses his advances. Sometimes, too, he catches a rhythm that might have been Shakespeare's:

These trickling Drops chase one another still,
As if the posting Messengers of Grief
Could overtake the Hours fled far away,
And make old Time come back.

The tears are Rowe's, the manner is more like Shakespeare's. Nor is it merely in the language that Shakespeare's influence may be found. *Jane Shore* was something that the neo-classical critics generally deplored in the drama: it was almost a historical play. True, his immediate model for this type of drama was not Shakespeare, but that despised dramatist, John Banks, an author of the previous generation as unlucky with his plays as Rowe was fortunate. But though the influence of Banks is obvious, it is Shakespeare who must be given the credit, and some of the blame, for *Jane Shore*.

It was possibly the appearance of Rowe's play that encouraged Theobald to write his poem in imitation of Shakespeare, which was published in the same year as *Jane Shore*—1714. *The Cave of Poverty, A Poem*.

¹ *Works*, ed. Elwin and Courthope, x, p. 372. Cf. Johnson (*Lives of the Poets*, ed. G. B. Hill, II, p. 69): 'The numbers, the diction, the sentiments, and the conduct, every thing in which imitation can consist, are remote in the utmost degree from the manner of Shakespeare. . . .' And cf. also *An Examen Of The New Comedy, Call'd The Suspicious Husband* . . ., 1747, p. 45.

Written in Imitation of Shakespeare, a longish exercise in the *Venus and Adonis* stanza, was dedicated to the Earl of Halifax. 'I know,' wrote Theobald, 'Your Lordship's Discernment will easily perceive, that my Imitation is very Superficial; extending only to the borrowing of some of his Words, without being able to follow him in the Position of them, his Style, or his Elegance.' This is on the whole true; but unfortunately Theobald seems frequently to be borrowing his words from Spenser rather than from Shakespeare, e.g.,

Mean while around the Walls fresh Murmurs creep
Like Notes of soft-ton'd Flutes on silver *Thames*:
Like *Phylomel* that sings the Night asleep,
Or purling Sounds of gentle-gliding Streams.

Theobald was still a young man; he would have done better than this a few years later. He has imitated Shakespeare, however, in his compound adjectives—'the Dew-bedabled Lev'ret,' 'Hell-pleasing Pray'rs,' 'the tender-hefted Swain,' 'the hot and fiery-pointed Sun.' But besides these and other quite recognisable attempts to imitate Shakespeare, there are more general traces of his influence on young Theobald's imagination, an influence which is not the less general because it may sometimes be referred to particular passages in his master, e.g.,

Thro' Thee, the Sea-boy climbs the giddy Mast,
And hears the furious Winds around him roar;
Beholds the whiten'd Surge; nor stands aghast,
Whilst curling Billows lash the sounding Shore.

Theobald was no Chatterton born out of his proper century; but it is at least significant that he never wrote so well as when he was attempting to reproduce the style and idiom of an earlier day. His work in the normal eighteenth-century manner is undistinguished, and, indeed, undistinguishable.

The question as to whether Theobald wrote *The Double Falsehood*, or whether, as he himself asserted, he made only some corrections in the manuscript, is hardly relevant here; for this tragedy, whether genuine or spurious, bears more resemblance to the work of one of Shakespeare's lesser contemporaries than of Shakespeare himself. There is, however, one other play of Theobald's which deserves a passing note. This is *Orestes, A Dramatic Opera* (1731). Theobald admitted to Warburton that in this play (which is much nearer a tragedy than an opera) he had imitated Shakespeare, particularly *Macbeth* and *Lear*¹. Actually, however, the most interesting signs of Shakespearean influence are to be found in the two comic scenes of the shipwrecked sailors. Those two scenes necessitated

¹ R. F. Jones, *Lewis Theobald*, p. 151.

prose; and the Grecian crew provided that almost forgotten touch of comic relief which the tragic drama of Theobald's own day absolutely forbade.

In 1725 a young Scottish poet wrote one of the most remarkable imitations of Shakespeare that the eighteenth century produced. A descriptive poem on Winter, it was the work of John Armstrong, afterwards celebrated as the author of *The Art of Preserving Health*. According to Armstrong, his imitation had just been completed when James Thomson's poem on the same subject appeared; but it is hard to believe that Armstrong was not unconsciously imitating his fellow-countryman as well as Shakespeare. Such a passage as this:

The shivering clown digs his obstructed way
Thro' the snow-barricadoed cottage door;
And muffled in his home-spun plaid encounters
With livid cheeks and rheum-distilling nose
The morning's sharp and scourging breath¹.

has more in common with the poet of the *Seasons* than with Shakespeare; but the extract is hardly fair to Armstrong, who can do much better than that. Besides the poem on Winter, Armstrong left two other imitations of Shakespeare, apparently written about the same time; these are fragments of a tragedy, attempted, as he tells us, 'at an age much too early for such achievements.' They are wild and bombastic in their utterance, and yet the imagination of a poet peeps, like the morn in one of his fragments, 'through the blotted thick-brow'd east.'

The airy citadel,
Perch'd like an eagle on a high-brow'd rock,
Shook the salt water from its stubborn sides
With eager quaking; the Cyclades appear'd
Like ducking Cormorants—Such a mutiny
Out-clamour'd all tradition...².

This is not quite Shakespeare, but neither is it Armstrong. Those early exercises of the young and untutored poet are perhaps the best examples we have of Shakespeare inspiring an enthusiastic imitator to write better than he knew. Armstrong, however, gave way to his century, and steered his course towards safer shores. *The Art of Preserving Health* contains many mature and delightful passages, but there is nothing in it of that reckless and promising failure which he had shown while he was still under the spell of Shakespeare.

A much more pedestrian imitation of Shakespeare appeared in 1737—William Havard's *King Charles the First, An Historical Tragedy*. Written

¹ First printed in *Miscellanies*; By John Armstrong, M.D., 1770, I, p. 150.

² *Miscellanies*, p. 163.

in *Imitation of Shakespear*. With it we may link William Shirley's *Edward the Black Prince; Or, The Battle of Poitiers, An Historical Tragedy. Attempted after the Manner of Shakespear* (1750). They may be taken together because, unless one were told, one would hardly guess that they were imitations of Shakespear at all. Even to the eighteenth-century reader the imitation was not apparent. 'It is very lucky,' one critic wrote in 1751, 'for that Gentleman who has enrich'd the World with the *Black-Prince*, that he thought of telling his Readers in his Title-Page that he aim'd at the manner of *Shakespear*, since without that Help, it would have been impossible for the most discerning Critic to discover the Similitude¹.' Apart from an occasional flash in this play, e.g.,

...the winds
That hang the curling billows in the clouds—

there is little in the language that has the least trace of Shakespear. What, then, did Havard and Shirley think that they were doing? Both plays take their themes from English history, and to that extent provoke comparison with Shakespear; and though neither is exactly a chronicle play both of them disregard the unities. There can be no doubt that many eighteenth-century dramatists chafed under the restrictions which the neo-classical idea of tragedy imposed upon them. The tone of regretful acquiescence is well seen in the prologue written by George Colman for Francklin's *Earl of Warwick* (1766):

In Shakespear's days, when his advent'rous muse,
A muse of fire! durst each bold license use,
Her noble ardour met no critic's phlegm,
To check wild fancy, or her flights condemn:
Ariels and Calibans unblam'd she drew,
Or goblins, ghosts, and witches, brought to view.
If to historic truth she shap'd her verse,
A nation's annals freely she'd rehearse;
Bring Rome's or England's story on the stage,
And run, in three short hours, thro' half an age.
Our bard, all terror-struck, and fill'd with dread,
In Shakespear's awful footsteps dares not tread....
Slowly and cautiously his way he makes,
And fears to fall at ev'ry step he takes.

It would appear, therefore, that when an eighteenth-century dramatist professed to imitate Shakespear he was sometimes only sheltering from the storm of hostile criticism which any departure from the recognised rules would bring upon his head. Shirley, however, was taken to task by

¹ *An Essay on the New Species of Writing Founded by Mr. Fielding*, 1751 (Bodleian: Godw. Pamph. 1859), pp 36-7.

an anonymous Gentleman of the Inner Temple who wrote a short criticism of his play:

It is very certain that *Shakespear* never observed any Rule, but that essential one of *Character*, and it is as certain perhaps that *Shakespear* was the best Dramatick Writer the World ever produced; from hence it has been urged, that Rules are not at all necessary, since we are not offended at the Breach of them in *Shakespear*. To which I answer, that every Man of true Judgment is offended at it, though we suffer or excuse his Faults, on account of his amazing Excellencies. And it is absurd to suppose, that if he had followed the Critical Rules (which are only Observations on Nature) and wrote with the same Spirit, that it would not have given to his Works a great Addition both of Fame and Excellence¹.

Shirley further annoyed this critic by introducing a ghost, and by the battle on the stage with which the play closes. Those two plays of Havard and of Shirley, then, are examples of imitation in which the imitator tries hardly at all to copy the language, but rather the general form of a Shakespearean play; and this may explain how difficult it sometimes is to recognise any likeness at all in those professed imitations of Shakespeare in the eighteenth century.

There is perhaps another reason: the imitator was often unwilling to repeat what he considered to be the faults of Shakespeare. This difficulty was noticed by the critic of 1751 quoted above. 'I don't think an Imitator is tied down to so strict an Adherence to his Original, as to transcribe his Defects as well as his Beauties: For a good Painter will soften an ugly Feature in a Portrait. . . .²' On the other hand, William Kenrick, in the preface to *Falstaff's Wedding* (1766), admitted that it had been necessary in some places to copy the blemishes of his author. It is unlikely that either Havard or Shirley would have agreed with him on this point. Shirley, indeed, seems to have aimed in his imitation at getting the best out of both types of drama, the Elizabethan and the neo-classical. In this, perhaps, he was only following up a trail that Aaron Hill had blazed rather uncertainly in 1716. In his dedication to *The Fatal Vision: Or, The Fall of Siam*, Hill had stated: 'I have endeavoured to observe the rules, with all the necessary strictness. And yet, at the same time, indulge the common taste, for fullness of design; and business, as our players call it. This new essay to reconcile the ancient, and the modern plans of Tragedy (the first endeavour of the kind) may possibly deserve improvement, from some future imitator.' Hill's statement is an interesting indication of how the average playgoer continued to appreciate 'fullness

¹ *An Examen of the Historical Play of Edward the Black Prince. By a Gentleman of the Inner Temple*, 1750, pp. 6-7.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 38-9. Pope laughs at those imitators whose imitation consists in 'copying the imperfections or blemishes of celebrated authors' (*The Art of Sinking in Poetry; Works*, ed. Elwin and Courthope, x, p. 372).

of design and business,' though the critics had managed to intimidate the playwrights into the construction of monotonously 'correct' and uneventful tragedies.

A half-hearted attempt at imitating Shakespeare was made by William Hawkins, who as Professor of Poetry at Oxford (1751-6) lectured on Shakespeare and endeavoured to defend him from his eighteenth-century critics. *Henry and Rosamond. A Tragedy* (1749) is not so bad a play as a professor might be expected to write; but Hawkins could not persuade the managers to produce it—a fact which is noted with some bitterness in the preface. He did not claim in his title-page to be imitating Shakespeare, but when attacked by Goldsmith in the *Critical Review* (August, 1759) he admitted the charge¹, and only reproached himself for having imitated Shakespeare spasmodically, and not throughout. Hawkins was undoubtedly loitering rather nervously in Shakespeare's footsteps; but much of his imitation goes no further back for its original than Otway, or even Rowe.

Chalmers, in his life of Sir William Jones, states that he left behind him a tragedy which 'has been totally lost, except part of a preface, in which he professes to have taken Shakespeare for his model, not by adopting his sentiments or borrowing his expressions, but by aiming at his manner, and by striving to write as he supposes he would have written himself, if he had lived in the eighteenth century².' It is not easy to imagine what this play could have been like; it must certainly have adhered to the unities, and had probably a diction entirely acceptable to the eighteenth century. It must, in fact, have been another of those imitations with almost no superficial resemblance to the work of Shakespeare. Clearly, therefore, the imitation of an ancient author meant more than one thing to the eighteenth century. There was the attempt to write a poem or a play which might be mistaken for the work of the author imitated; there was the imitation of such a poet as Horace, which generally consisted in taking one of his odes and rewriting it with modern allusions or in aiming at the tone and general scope of his satires; and there was this ambitious endeavour to say for an ancient writer what he might be expected to say for himself if he revisited the modern world and became naturalised to it. The method of Sir William Jones here seems to have something in common with that which Oldisworth assures us was pursued by Edmund Smith. 'When he was upon a Subject, he would seriously consider what

¹ *A Review of the Works of the Rev. Mr. Hawkins... By an Impartial Reader*, MDCCCLX, p. 47. The 'impartial reader' is almost certainly Hawkins himself.

² *The Works of the English Poets*, 1810, xviii, p. 433.

Demosthenes, Homer, Virgil, or Horace, if alive, would say upon that Occasion...¹

In 1766 one of the most successful dramatic imitations of Shakespeare was published: *Falstaff's Wedding. A Comedy. Being A Sequel to the Second Part of the Play Of King Henry The Fourth Written in Imitation of Shakespeare. By Mr. Kenrick*. The title-page is dated 1760, the preface 1766; but that is apparently to be explained by Kenrick's statement in the preface that the play had remained 'six years in the bookseller's warehouse after it was printed.' This delay was presumably due to the fact that Kenrick was hoping to have the play performed, and publication was held up in consequence. According to Kenrick, *Falstaff's Wedding* was a juvenile piece, 'written so long ago as the year 1751.' His friends had persuaded him to offer it to Garrick, who called it the only good imitation of Shakespeare he had ever met with, but failed to accept it. Garrick's explanation was that he could not venture 'to bring so many known characters of Shakespeare's upon the stage in a new performance,' but the excuses which a harassed manager makes for rejecting a play he does not want should not, perhaps, be examined too closely. Nevertheless the play was ultimately accepted, and performed at Drury Lane on April 12, 1766. 'As to its applause,' Kenrick writes, 'it was not indeed attended with that forced and melancholy clapping, which is mechanically clattered from the partial hands of a paper-raised audience; but, if an involuntary roar of laughter, from the beginning to the end of the play, be applause; this it certainly had².'

Kenrick began, of course, with certain definite advantages; he was simply taking over Falstaff, Bardolph, Pistol, and the rest from Shakespeare, and adding a few characters of his own creation. The same type of imitation was carried through more or less successfully by F. G. Waldron at the end of the century in *The Virgin Queen, A Drama in Five Acts; Attempted As A Sequel To Shakespeare's Tempest* (1797). Kenrick is more conscious than Shakespeare's early imitators of the changes in language and outlook, and is therefore better able to lay hold of the altered idiom and vocabulary. He is also imitating the comedy of Shakespeare; and that, as has been suggested, is easier to copy than the tragedy. The merit of his play, indeed, lies entirely in the Falstaff scenes; the part which deals (in blank verse) with the plot against the King and his romantic love

¹ *The Works of Mr. Edmund Smith... To which is prefix'd, A Character of Mr. Smith, by Mr. Oldsworth* (3rd edition, 1719, p. 10).

² The authority for this and the preceding statements about Kenrick's play will be found in *A Letter to David Garrick, Esq. From William Kenrick LL.D., 1772* (3rd edition the same year). The play was apparently taken off after a single performance.

affair fails, as usual, to catch more than a few distant echoes of Shakespeare's style. Kenrick's success is due to the fact that he does really know his Falstaff; he has got inside the fat knight's skin. The result is that *Falstaff's Wedding* frequently rings almost true, and is often genuinely amusing. *The Virgin Queen* is not quite so successful, partly because Caliban is less easy to imitate than Falstaff, and also because a considerable part of the play is serious and therefore shows up the imitator more unkindly. It is not, however, exactly a failure, except, perhaps, in the treatment of Ariel who continually sinks through Waldron's verse and becomes merely mortal.

There are other dramatists who wrote successful imitations of the earlier drama, e.g., Walpole's *The Mysterious Mother* (1768) and James Tobin's *The Honey-Moon* and *The Curfew*¹, but who were not professedly imitating Shakespeare. Ireland's *Vortigern*, too, falls within the limits of the century; but it is scarcely a professed imitation either, and has been too fully discussed to require further treatment here. One hardly knows whether to commend the cleverness of the forger, or to marvel at the obtuseness of the public which he managed to delude. *Vortigern*, however, did produce a remarkable sequel, one of the few successful parodies of Shakespeare. This was Henry Dudley Bates's *Passages Selected by Distinguished Personages, On the Great Literary Trial of Vortigern and Rowena*, which appeared in five parts between 1795 and 1807. Misplaced ingenuity can rarely have gone further. The passages selected were not, of course, taken from *Vortigern* at all, but were the work of Dudley himself. Many of them are far nearer to Shakespeare than the best passages in Ireland's forgery, and if their author had avoided a tendency to exaggerate the antiquated spelling they would be even better than they are. The following is a good specimen of Dudley's skill:

I remember me a Prisonne-keeper's daughter at Aleppo, whom a haire-brained Counte did rescue from her iron bondage; and yet, forgetful of her own deliverance, she did afterwards employ her matron-houres in setting silken sprunges, to catch you littel boyes, as they do larkes on a furzeblowne common!

By this time the imitator of Shakespeare was writing for a far more critical audience than Nicholas Rowe had to satisfy in 1714; and the measure of difference may be seen by comparing the imitation of Rowe with those of Dudley, almost a hundred years later.

The growing sense of responsibility towards Shakespeare's text, which came with a more intimate knowledge of his works and his age, is further illustrated by the changing attitude of those who adapted his plays for

¹ Printed in 1805 and 1807, but written earlier. Tobin died in 1804.

the eighteenth-century stage. Men like Hill and Cibber had made little attempt to bring their additional scenes and interpolations into line with those parts of Shakespeare which they retained; but as the century wore on, conscientious efforts were made to ensure that the modern additions should not look out of place in the original play. William Hawkins, who endeavoured to make *Cymbeline* acceptable to his own generation (*Cymbeline. A Tragedy, Altered from Shakespeare... MDCCLIX.*), indicated in the preface how he had approached the task of modernising Shakespeare. 'I have thought it an honour to tread in his steps, and to imitate his Stile, with the humility and reverence of a *Son*. With this view, I have retained in *many* places the very language of the original author, and in *all* others endeavoured to supply it with a diction similar thereunto, so that, as an unknown friend of mine has observed, the present attempt is intirely *new*, whether it be considered as an *alteration from*, or an *imitation of Shakespeare*¹. Similarly, the title-page of James Goodhall's *King Richard II. A Tragedy. Alter'd from Shakespear, And The Stile Imitated* (1772) shows the same anxiety to respect the age in which his author wrote. Goodhall, however, did not succeed in getting his play produced².

In conclusion, it should be emphasised that the influence of Shakespeare on eighteenth-century drama was much more considerable than a survey of the professed imitations would indicate. A 'tang of Shakespeare' is to be found in many dramatists who do not claim to imitate him at all. The actual professed imitation of Shakespeare only shows more distinctly an influence that was at work in many unexpected places. That his imitators had so little success need hardly be wondered at; their task, as has been indicated, was beset with difficulties. 'I don't know,' writes the anonymous critic of 1751, 'whether their Task, if they arrive at any Perfection in it, is not more difficult than that of a good Translator. For they must write in the Manner of the copied Author, without taking his very Thoughts, and when they enter upon a Subject, must go on with it not as he has, but as he would have pursued it. It requires a great deal of Judgment, and a very intent Perusal of a Man's Works to fall exactly into a similar Method of Stile and Sentiment with him'³.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

¹ Cf. also the Prologue:

Happy the varied phrase, if none shall call,
This imitation; that original.

² In addition to the titles given in the text, the following are also relevant: *A Fit of the Spleen. In Imitation of Shakespear.* By Dr. Ibbot (*A Collection of Poems in Six Volumes. By Several Hands*, 1758, v, p. 202. Ibbot died in 1725), *Epilogue to Shakespear's first Part of King Henry IV... 1748; Spoken by Mr. J. Y. in the Character of Falstaff...* (*ibid.*, p. 281); *A Letter To A Member of Parliament... To Which is annex'd. A Meditation On A Great Man, After the Manner of Sir John Falstaff...* (Bodleian, 1730?).

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 38-9.

NOTES ON THE POEMS OF BERTRAN DE BORN¹

II.

2. SIRVENTES.

Song 9. Contained in MSS. ACDFIKMR.

This is the earliest extant piece of Bertran de Born to which a precise date can be assigned, though there is every reason to believe, from the opening verses, that he had already acquired a considerable reputation as a poet at the time, for an important person like the Count of Toulouse to think it worth his while to enlist Bertran's services as a propagandist in his cause. The present sirventes deals with a certain phase of the protracted struggle between Raymond V, Count of Toulouse (1148-94) and Alphonso II (1162-96), King of Aragon and Count of Barcelona, which originated in their dispute over the ownership of the county of Provence, acquired in 1112 by the house of Barcelona through the marriage of Ramon Berenguer III (†1131), Count of Barcelona, grandfather of Alphonso II, with Douce, heiress of Provence. On the death of Ramon Berenguer III, his elder son, of the same name, inherited the county of Barcelona, to which he added Aragon by his betrothal in 1137 to Petronila, heiress of Aragon; while the county of Provence was assigned to the second son, Berenguer Ramon I, who bequeathed it to his son, Ramon Berenguer II, cousin of Alphonso II of Aragon. After the death in 1166, at the siege of Nice, of Ramon Berenguer II, Raymond V of Toulouse took possession of the county, on the plea that the only daughter of Ramon Berenguer II had been betrothed to his elder son; and, in order to fortify his claim, Raymond married Richilde, widow of Ramon Berenguer II. Thereupon Alphonso II, who regarded himself as his cousin's rightful heir, crossed the Pyrenees at the head of a large force, assumed the title of 'marquis' or 'count' of Provence, and conquered the county, where he was able, despite Raymond, to maintain his authority, his brothers acting as his lieutenants during his absence in his Spanish possessions. The quarrel was settled for the time being in 1176 by the treaty of Gernica, according to which Raymond promised to give up all his pretended rights to the county of Provence, in return for a large sum of money. But, the year after, another

¹ Continued from *Modern Language Review*, xxvii, p. 419.

motive for conflict arose; Ermengarde, Viscountess of Narbonne, seeing herself threatened by Raymond, who claimed to be her overlord, appealed to her friend Alphonso II, who with her help proceeded to form a coalition against Raymond. In 1179 Raymond replied with a like measure, and hostilities continued for the next two years. In the course of some guerilla fighting in the neighbourhood of Montpellier, Ramon Berenguer, brother of Alphonso and his representative in Provence, was ambushed (April 5, 1181) and killed along with some of his knights—his friends said murdered—by Ademar, son of Sicard, lord of Murviel near Béziers, one of Raymond's partisans (G. de Vigeois, ed. Labbe, p. 326). Alphonso, bent on avenging his brother's death, laid siege in June to the castle of Murviel, captured it and rased it to the ground. This done, he invaded the county of Toulouse, destroyed several castles belonging to the Count and pitched his camp before the very walls of his capital, the neighbourhood of which he laid waste and pillaged. He then passed on to Aquitaine to confer with Henry II of England, his ally (*Histoire de Languedoc*, vi, *passim*, and *Gesta Comitum Barcinonensium*, chap. 22). Raymond, hard pressed—so we may conclude from Bertran's words—appealed for help to the discontented barons of Aquitaine, who, as enemies of their overlord Henry II and his friend Alphonso II of Aragon, would naturally side with the Count of Toulouse. Strophes 3–6 refer clearly to this last campaign, so that the composition of the poem may safely be assigned to the summer of 1181 or soon after. Incidentally this date is confirmed by a detail in strophe 7: the 'Bernardo' mentioned in v. 41 can only be Bernard IV, Count of Comminge, who did not succeed his father Dodo till 1181 (*Art de vérifier les dates*, ix, p. 279).

It is interesting to see Bertran de Born siding at this date against Alphonso II of Aragon for whom his dislike was to turn a few years later to bitter hatred (cp. Nos. 21 and 22). On the other hand, Bertran's contemporary, Peire Vidal, alluding to the same events but envisaging them from a different point of view, in the song *Drogoman senher*, leaves no doubt that his sympathies are with Alphonso, who was well known as a protector of the troubadours, and himself practised the poetic art in his leisure hours.

9, 1-3

Lo coms m'a mandat e mogut
Per n'Aramon Luc d'Esparro
Qu'ieu fassa per lui tal chanzo....

We may accept without demur, I think, Thomas' explanation to the effect that *Aramon* is a Gascon form of *Raimon*, *Ramon* (*Romania*, xxii, p. 591), it being a peculiarity of that dialect to affix an epenthetic *a* to

words beginning with *r* (cp. Meyer-Lübke, *GRS.*, I, p. 383, and W. Kalbow, *Die Germanischen Personennamen des altfr. Heldenepos*, 1913, p. 88); and also his further claim that, since the person in question is represented as an emissary of the Count of Toulouse, Esparron near Aurignac (Dép. Haute-Garonne) is probably the place intended.

9, 7

Et er ops que sia atendut.

The construction is impersonal: 'and it will be necessary that the matter be attended to.'

9, 13-18

A Tolosa, part Montagut,
Fermara·l coms son gonfano
15 A·l prat comtal jostal peiro,
E quan aura son trap tendut,
E nos lotjarem de viro,
Tan que tres nochs i jairem nut.

Though it does not occur in any of the MSS., *E nos lotjarem de viro* (v. 17), which has the advantage of accounting for the vague *lor* of the MSS., evolved from the various readings by Levy (*Archiv f. d. Stud. der neueren Sprachen*, CLII, pp. 265-6), is probably the right version and is certainly preferable to *E nos lor travrem de viro* of Stimming³ with its suspicious dative after *travre*. In the last verse Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.) renders *nut* literally; Stimming³ by 'ohne Obdach'; Thomas by 'sans abri' in his glossary, but by 'sur la terre nue' in his introduction (p. xxi), which seems to be the meaning, the implication being that those in the camp are so numerous that only after three days will the required number of tents have been pitched. In the last verse *si que* of all the MSS., save A, should be adopted. As the *Prat Comtal* and the *Peiro* (the name of the latter still persists to this day in the Rue Peyrou and the Place Peyrou) were localities in Toulouse, they should both be written with a capital. The *Peiro* is also mentioned by Peire Vidal (ed. Anglade², xx, p. 88) and by Guilhem de Berguedan (Milá y Fontanals, *De los Trovadores en España*, 1889, p. 30).

9, 23-24

Qui per aver, que per somo,
Qui per pretz s'i seran mogut.

Some explanation of the use of distributive *qui-qui*, corresponding to *qui-qui* in Mod. French, should have been given in Stimming's commentary. For its extensive application in the Romance languages, see Meyer-Lübke, *op. cit.*, III, p. 223. As *precis* (Stimming³) and *somo* are approximately equivalent, *pretz* with Thomas and Appel, according to CDIK, is certainly preferable, as is also Appel's *s'i seran mogut*, with A (Stimming³ and Thomas have *i seran vengut*), in view of the fact that

vengut appears at the rhyme in the first verse (v. 25) of the next strophe.

9, 25-30

25 E desse que serem *vengut*,
 Mesclar s'a·l torneis pel chambo,
 E·lh Catala e·lh d'Arago
 Tombaran soven e menut,
 Que ja no·ls sostenran arzo;
 30 Tan grans colps los ferrem nos drut.

On the use of the separable future (v. 26) in the Romance languages, see the recent and valuable paper of G. Rohlfis, in *Archivum Romanicum*, vi, pp. 105 ff. In v. 27 preference should again be given to the reading of Thomas: *E Catala e·lh d'Arago*, according to CIKMR: ADF alone have *ell* at the beginning of the line. *I ferrem* of CFMR, adopted by Stimming¹ and by Thomas, is certainly much better than *los ferrem* of ADIK: one can hardly admit that Bertran allowed himself the Gasconism *los* = *lor*, and to interpret it as an accusative with Bartsch (*Zeit. rom. Ph.*, III, p. 424), recalling and emphasising *colps* ('such great blows them (blows) will we deal'), would result in a very awkward construction. Appel, Stimming, and Thomas, interpret *drut* (v. 30) as an adverb ('thickly,' corresponding to Mod. Fr. *dru*) qualifying *ferrem*. Apart from the redundancy of the word so understood, the same idea being already expressed in v. 28 (*soven e menut*), the whole tenor of the piece with its fine swagger leads me to believe that *nos* and *drut* go together (cp. *Nos Lemozi, et envezat*, 15, 44), and that *drut* must be taken as a noun in the well-attested sense of 'faithful friend.' It may even well be that the word was already assuming the meaning 'stout,' 'lusty,' Fr. 'gaillard' (as in O.F. and in Mod. Provençal), which is that of Keltic *druto* (Welsh *drut*), from which *drut* and its derivatives originated.

9, 37-42

Lo reis qu'a Tarasco perdut
 E·l senher de Mon-Albeo,
 Rotgiers, e·l filhs Bernart Oto
 40 E lo coms Peire lor n'aiut
 E·l coms de Fois ab Bernardo
 E·n Sanso, frair del rei veneut.

Of the eight MSS. five read *monalbeo* (M has *monalbio* and R *monalbeta*), which has not been identified. C has *monarbezo*, adopted by Thomas. According to him this stands for Monterbedon or Monterbezo, a famous convent of the order of Grandmont, often mentioned in contemporary documents (cp. *Histoire de Languedoc*, vi, pp. 135 and 203-4), a few miles from Montpellier. In that case the 'lord of Monterbezo' would be Guilhem VIII of Montpellier (1172-1202), who was then the ally of King Alphonso II of Aragon and the enemy of the Count of Toulouse. As

one MS. only reads *monarbezo*, I suggest that the original reading was *monalio* and that the person referred to is Bernard d'Alio, Baron of Usson, a vassal of Alphonso II of Aragon (cp. *Histoire de Languedoc*, VI, pp. 91, 568, 601), mentioned by Peire Vidal (ed. Anglade², p. 107).

The rather meagre information supplied by Stimming³ and Thomas concerning the other allies of Alphonso II mentioned in this strophe requires some amplification: *Rotgier* is Roger II, Viscount of Béziers and Carcassonne (1167–1204), who at the age of eighteen succeeded his father Raimond Trencavel, murdered in 1167. Supported by Alphonso II of Aragon, he was able to maintain himself in his inheritance, despite the fact that Count Raymond V of Toulouse had made a gift of his territory to Roger Bernard I, Count of Foix, in order to punish him for having done homage to the King of Aragon. In 1171 Roger II made peace with the Count of Toulouse and married his daughter Adelaide, and, as Adelaide was a niece of the King of France, the Viscount of Béziers became the immediate vassal of the French crown. About the same time he also became reconciled with the Count of Foix. In 1179 he changed front again, declared himself formally the vassal of Alphonso of Aragon and joined the latter against his own father-in-law (*Histoire de Languedoc*, VI, *passim*). The son of Bernard Ato or Atho (most of the scribes puzzled by the name have substituted the more familiar Oto or Otho) is Bernart Ato VI, born about 1159, Viscount of Nîmes and Agde till 1187, when he handed over the viscounty of Nîmes to the Count of Toulouse and that of Agde to the church of that town. As he was the son of a brother of Raimond Trencavel of Béziers, he was a first cousin of Roger II, mentioned above. In 1179 he did homage to Alphonso II of Aragon and sided with him against the Count of Toulouse. *Lo coms Peire* stands for Pedro de Lara, son of Don Manrique de Lara (died 1164), one of the most powerful grandees of Castile, and of Ermessinde, sister of Ermengarde, Viscountess of Narbonne (1143–92). In 1177 Ermengarde appointed Pedro as her heir, in place of his brother Aimeric, who had died that year without issue; and he succeeded her when she abdicated formally in 1192, though she had to all intents and purposes handed over her powers to her nephews much before her death. Pedro abdicated in his turn two years later in favour of his son and retired to the court of Castile where he filled important functions till his demise in 1202. Aimeric de Lara joined the league formed in 1176 by Alphonso II of Aragon against the Count of Toulouse; and in 1179 we find Pedro in that monarch's train when he visited Provence (*Histoire de Languedoc*, VI, pp. 70, 89, 139; and Salazar y Castro, *Historia genealogica de la casa de Lara*, *passim*). It is probable

that Pedro de Lara took part in the campaign of 1180-1 undertaken by Alphonso II in the Toulousain, to which the present sirventes refers, although no mention of this is made by any of the chroniclers. By the 'Count of Foix' is meant Roger Bernard I, Count of Foix since 1149 approximately and brother-in-law of Roger II, Viscount of Béziers. At first he was friendly with Raymond of Toulouse, but later he went over to Alphonso of Aragon and was present at the signing of the treaty of peace between the two in 1176. When war broke out afresh shortly afterwards he again helped Alphonso who was his cousin; and in 1185 Alphonso entrusted him with the administration of Provence. He died in November, 1188 (*Histoire de Languedoc*, VI, *passim* and *Art de vérifier les dates*, IX, pp. 435-6). *Bernardo* in the same verse, as we have seen, stands for Bernard IV, Count, since 1181, of Comminge, in Gascony (Dép. Haute-Garonne), who died in 1226, and on whom further details can be found in *l'Art de vérifier les dates*, IX, pp. 279-80. The reference in the last verse is to Sancho, whom his brother Alphonso II of Aragon appointed as his lieutenant in the county of Provence in 1181, after the death of their elder brother Ramon Berenguer who had previously occupied that position, but whom he replaced four years later by Roger Bernard I, Count of Foix.

9, 43-44

De lai pensen de guarnizo,
Que de sai lor or atendut.

'Aufpassen' (Stimming³) or 'erwarten' (Appel, *Lieder*, Gloss.) for *attendre ad alcu* is not appropriate here. In spite of what Levy says (*Archiv*, CXLII, p. 266) the meaning is clear enough if *attendre ad alcu* is taken in the same sense as in *v. 7* (above), but tauntingly and ironically: 'yonder let them think of arming themselves, for here they will be attended to,' i.e., we shall be ready to deal with them. The construction is again impersonal, as in *v. 7*.

Song 10. Contained in MSS. AIKa¹d.

If, as seems probable, strophe 3 of this sirventes refers to the war between the King of France, Philippe Auguste, and his namesake the Count of Flanders, which culminated in the peace of La Grange Saint-Arnoul (see A. Cartellieri, *Philipp II, August, König von Frankreich*, I, pp. 116 ff.), it must have been written in the spring of 1182.

10, 1-7

Cortz e guerras e joi d'amor
Mí solian far esbaudir
E tener gai e chantador,
Tro per lieis cui dei obezir
5 Mí fo mos chantars devedatz;
E tot en lei
Es com mos chanz es torneiatz.

The last part of this strophe, left unexplained by Stimming³ and Thomas, cannot possibly be right in the version of Stimming³ who follows the reading of IK:

Tro per leis cui dei obezir
 Mi fo mos chantars devedatz,
 Et en la lei
 Es mos chans escomoniatz.

The solution is probably contained in MS. a¹ in which the two last verses run as in Appel's text, and which Levy (*Archiv*, CXLII, pp. 142, 265), who first drew attention to this reading, renders: 'und von ihr hängt es ganz ab, nur bei ihr liegt die Entscheidung, wie mein Sang gewendet wird, d.h., ob ich singen darf oder nicht.' For this meaning of *esser* Levy refers to *SW.* (*esser* 19) and quotes two additional examples. Levy's interpretation is very convincing and is moreover fortified by the reading (*veus cum mos chants es tornejat*) of A in v. 7.

10, 8–14. The first four verses offer no difficulty:

Ara sui assoutz en amor,
 E veiretz anar e venir
 10 Chanzos, puous a la belazor
 Platz que mos chans de'acohir. . .

In vv. 12–14 the MSS. read *E mos rasases acordatz E nona negun delz comtatz* (A), *En monranza ses acordatz Son cors a drei E no i ac negus dels comtatz* (IK), *E monranza ses acordatz E nona negun dels comtatz* (a¹). Stimming³ (the verses are left blank in Appel) reads:

En m'onranza, s'es acordatz
 Son cors a drei,
 E non a negu dels comtatz.

For the last four verses Stimming³ (p. 158) adopts the rendering proposed by Andresen (*Zeit. rom. Ph.*, XVIII, pp. 268–9): 'da es der Schönsten gefällt, meinen Sang zu meiner Ehrung (d.h., was mir zur Ehre gereicht) zu gestatten, wenn er ihrer Person in richtiger (geziemender) Weise dargebracht wird, und da sie keinen der kleinen Grafen hat (sc. als Verehrer).' On the whole this interpretation may pass for lack of a better, but only if *mos chans* is emended to *mon chant*, which *acohir* demands. Moreover, to assign to *comtat* the meaning 'little count,' first suggested by Tobler, is rather rash; as we have in this case no clue of any kind to what circumstances Bertran may be alluding, it is advisable to take the word in its usual acceptance.

10, 15–21

15 Del pauc rei de Terra-Maior
 Mi platz qu'aissi·s vol enantir,
 Qu'oi mais lo tenran per senhor
 Cilh que·lh devon so fieu servir.
 Puous vencut los a ves Arratz.

V. 19, and vv. 21 and 22 (left blank by Appel) appear as follows in the MSS.: *Pois uenca lor affars auratz. E cobre sos dreitz daus totz latz* (A), *Pois uencut lor auas aratz. Ar es estei. E cobre ses dreitz* (IK), *Pos uengutz lor auar auratz. Aprez sestei E tolre son dreiz uas totz latz* (a¹). In Stimming³ the last three verses read as follows:

20 Puous uencut los a ves Arratz,
Ara s'estei
E cobre sos drechs daus totz latz.

Levy (*Archiv*, CXLII, p. 268) confesses his inability to understand v. 18, which he queries in *SW.* (XI, 418 a). There is really no difficulty and French still says (cp. *DG.* under *servir*) *servir un fief*, 'remplir les obligations qui y étaient attachées.' Raynouard (*LR.*, III, p. 293) renders the verse in question quite rightly by 'ceux qui doivent servir son fief.' Marcabru in *Empereur, per mi mezeis* (ed. Dejeanne, No. XXII) uses the expression in the first *tornada*, and again in the second *tornada*: *Qu'ieu non sai per que princes vu S'a Dieu no vai son fieu servir*. In v. 20 (lacking in A), IK, as we have seen, have *Ar es estei* and a¹ has *Aprez sestei*. Stimming and Thomas emend to *Ara s'estei*, but give no clue as to how they interpret *s'estar*, omitted by the way from their glossaries. In the glossary to Stimming¹ *s'estar* is translated by 'verweilen,' which does not suit the context, any more than Appel's 'bleib' er dabei' (*Bertran von Born*, p. 26), especially if, as is probable, Bertran is referring to the war in the first half of the year 1182 between Philippe Auguste and the Count of Flanders which resulted in the recognition by the Count of the overlordship of the King of France. I am disposed to think that one ought to read *Aras estei* and see in *estar* the equivalent of *instare*, of which Levy (*SW.*, III, p. 309 b) registers one example: 'since he (Philippe Auguste) has conquered them (his enemies) towards Arras, let him persist (in his course) and recover his rights on all sides!' In the glossary to *Lieder* Appel renders *s'estar* (presumably with the reading *Ara s'estei*) by 'beharren,' but I can find no example of reflective *estar* with that meaning.

19, 24-25

Quar mielhs s'en poiran vavassor
E chastela de lor jauzir.

'Nutzen haben,' as Stimming³, for *se jauzir d'alcu*, is very doubtful and is queried by *PD.* The usual meaning ('se réjouir') seems adequate and there is no need to adopt Tobler's *del lor* (Stimming¹, p. 252) instead of *de lor*.

19, 29-30

E·l volpill de l'emperador
Volian Lombart envazir.

These verses can only mean: 'and the Lombards wished to attack the coward of an emperor,' in which case the article before *emperador* should

be deleted. The whole strophe is lacking in IKd and probably does not belong to the present song.

10, 36-42 Be sai que li malparlador,
 Quar vuolh de lor guilas ver dir,
 M'en apelaran sofridor,
 Quar mi lais forzar e balhir;
 40 Que·ls dos que mos frair m'a juratz....

The last two verses of this strophe, left blank by Appel, appear in the following form in Stimming³:

Et autre autrei
 Vol retenir l'autra meitatz.

In v. 40 A reads *quels dos que mos frair ma iuratz*, while IKd (which really only count as one) have *del don que men frair mauiatz* (Kd *mauiatz*) *iuratz*. V. 41, absent in A, shows *e far autre autrei*, which gives one syllable in excess. Stimming³ omits *far* in v. 41 and, following a suggestion of Chabaneau (*Rev. langues rom.*, XXXII, p. 204), renders *meitatz* by 'Partei,' which he takes as the subject; so that according to his version the translation of vv. 40-42 would run: 'for the gifts which my brother (Constantine) has sworn on oath to grant me and any other concession the other party wishes to retain.' By so doing he attributes to *meitatz* a meaning the word can hardly carry, apart from the further objection that we have already a subject in *mos frair*. Starting from the supposition that it is more likely that the scribe wrote *autre* twice than that he added *far* independently, Levy (*SW.*, p. 283 a) proposed the reading *e (= en) fals autrei* or *e (= et) fag autrei*, and, further, the more violent emendation of *l'autra meitatz* to *l'outracurdatz*. If we read *Qu'els dos* (cp. *del don* of IKd) instead of *Que·ls dos*, adopt Levy's *e fag autrei*, and modify *l'autra meitatz* to *l'autrui meitatz*, we get, without any material departure from the MS. tradition, what seems to me a reasonably clear rendering: 'for in the gifts which my brother has promised me on oath and granted me he wishes to retain the halves of others.' In that case *autrui* would refer not only to Bertran himself but also to his children whose land he accused his brother Constantine, in a subsequent piece (20, 41-42), of coveting.

10, 43-49 Puois no volon drech ni amor
 Faire ni negu plach sofrir,
 45 Ges per.....
 S'ieu m'en podia revestir,
 No dei esser malrazonatz;
 Qu'ilh fan plaidei
 Mantas vetz qu'om no·ls n'a prejat.

In the last six syllables of v. 45, left blank by Appel, A has *lezidors dobrador*, IK *lei eras doblador*, and a¹ *lezeros doblador*. The emendation *lezeros d'obrador* ('shop loafers'), first proposed by Chabaneau (*Rev.*

langues rom., xxxii, p. 204), more than forty years ago, can be safely accepted since it is confirmed by the Campori MS. (a¹). In the previous verse *faure* occurs in none of the MSS. and Thomas was well advised to adopt the reading of IKd (*Mrei fraure ni negun plach sofrir*), with the modification of *mrei fraure* to *mei frair* for the sake of the measure: Bertran had another brother, beside Constantine, called Itier, who had apparently sided with Constantine against Bertran in the feud concerning the ownership of Autafort and its dependencies. *En* of v. 46, which Appel (*Bertran von Born*, p. 27) refers to *drech* (v. 43), seems to me to apply rather to *meitatz* (v. 42), while *ilh* (v. 48) stands for Bertran's two brothers.

10, 52-54

Quan ieu pren e tuolh la ricor
D'aquels que no·m laisson garir,
Dizon que trop m'i sui cochatz.

Ricor should not be rendered by 'Reichtum' (Stimming³) or by 'richesse' (Thomas), but by 'Besitz' (*SW.*, *ricor* 2), as in the following passage of Folquet de Romans (ed. Zenker, p. 60, *vv.* 31 ff.), not noted by Levy:

Ben volgr' aguessem un senhor
Ab tan de poder e d'albir
Qu'als avols tolges la ricor
E no·ls laisses terra tenir.

Thomas' 'laisser en paix' for *laiszar garir* is queried by Levy (*SW.*, *garir* 6) and by Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss. under *garir*), though it is difficult to see by what else to replace it.

10, 60-62

En Oc-e-No ama mais patz
Ab Felip, crei,
Que·l frair Johans deseretatz.

Andresen (*Zeit. rom. Ph.*, xviii, p. 269) objects, with good reason I think, to the reading *Ab Felip, crei*, on the ground that *crei* so used, without any addition, is foreign to Provençal, which would say *so crei* or *so·m par*. He proposes *Ab fe lo crei*, with which he compares *Don turt crezem ab leral fe segura* of 30, 7. John Lackland was a mere youth of seventeen when the present sirventes was written, and what Bertran probably means to imply, mockingly, is that Richard was no more inclined to war than his young brother.

Song 11. Contained in MSS. ACDFIK.

For the date of this piece, see the note to *vv.* 33-36.

11, 9-13

A! Puoi-Guilielm e Clarenz e Granhol
10 E Saint-Astier, mout avetz gran onor,
Et ieu mezeis, qui conoisser la·m vol,
Et.....maior
D'en Charretier que guerpis la charreta.

In v. 12 both Stimming and Thomas write *Et a sobrier Engolesmes maior*, following C. The other MSS. read *Et a sobrier totz engolmes maior* (A), *Et torena et engolmes maior* (DFIK). All the MSS., it will be noticed, have *engolmes* (Angoumois) or *engolesmes* (Angoulême); from which we may conclude that Bertran is alluding to the brave stand of the Counts of Angoulême against Richard ever since the strife which had arisen in the autumn of 1181 concerning the succession to the county. The late Count, Wulgrin III, Talhafer, had died on June 29 leaving an only child, a girl (Maud). Richard, as Duke of Aquitaine, took Maud into his wardship as heiress of Angoulême and claimed also the wardship of the land, which he hoped perhaps to gain permanently by that means ('cum puella terram obtinere tentavit,' says Geoffrey of Vigeois). Guilhem Talhafer and Ademar, Wulgrin's brothers, on the other hand, maintained they were the rightful heirs, and had been engaged for some time in warfare with Richard for the preservation of Angoulême to the male line. At some unspecified date the Angoulême brothers turned for help in the unequal struggle to the King of France, and Guilhem Talhafer, the elder brother, offered his homage for the county to Philippe Auguste, as we may learn from the first *tornada* of the present sirventes, a circumstance not recorded by any of the chroniclers:

Del rei Felip sabrem be, si paireia
O s'el segra los usatges Charlo
D'en Talhafer, que per senhor l'autreia
D'Engolesme, et el l'en a fach do.

This step was a direct challenge to Richard which Bertran hoped would lead to a rupture between the Duke and the King of France.

When Bertran (*v.* 13) accuses the Young King, whom he likens metaphorically to a carter, of having left his cart in the lurch, he may have had in mind the reconciliation which had taken place in June 1182 between the Young King and Richard and which had been confirmed for the time being by the presence of the former at the siege of Périgueux (Geoffrey of Vigeois, 330-1).

11, 17-18 Si'l rics vescoms que es chaps dels Gascons,
A cui s'ate Bearns e Gavardas.

Stimming³ and Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.) take *s'ate* as from *s'atener* which they render, presumably by analogy with O.F. *atenir*, by 'gehören' and 'zugehören' respectively, for which I can find no parallel. I understand *s'ate* as the third person pres. ind. of *s'atendre a*, 'to pay heed to,' 'to obey.' Cp. note to 22, 44.

11, 22-24 Et eissamen, aissi com el es pros,
Ab sa gran ost, qu'atrai e que amassa,
Passe s'en sai et ajoste s ab nos.

As *s'ajostar* can only refer to Richard, against whom are banded the rebels, including Bertran, Appel's 'sich vereinigen' falsifies the meaning and should be replaced by Thomas' 'en venir aux mains,' an acceptation of the word not noticed by lexicographers, but confirmed by the following verses, for example, of *Girart de Roussillon* (O). *Lai o Frances s'aiostent a Borgevnnus, Aico fun dous e talle e iresuns.*

11, 25-28

25 Si Talhaborcs e Ponz e Lizinhas
E Mauleos e Taunais fos en pes,
Et a Sivrai fos vescoms vius e sas,
Ja no creirai que no nos auudes.

Thomas (*Romania*, xxii, pp. 591-2) thinks that the expression *esser en pes* is equivalent to *sâ*, 'healthy' (which by the way should not be rendered by 'vernünftig' as Stimming³ or by 'bei Verstand' as Appel, *Lieder*, Gloss.) of the next verse. This is by no means certain and is queried by Levy (*SW.*, pe 10). More likely is Stimming's 'auf den Füßen,' 'tatig sein,' corresponding to our 'afoot,' preferable also to Appel's 'kriegs-bereit sein.' On the other hand Stimming's 'träge' for *vâ* is undoubtedly wrong; the word, as in O.F., has here the value of 'feeble.'

With regard to the various barons mentioned in this strophe, we know nothing of Richard's relations at this period with Aimeric de Thouars, Raoul de Mauleon, and the lords of Tonnay and Sivray. The lord of Pons and Taillebourg, however, was an old enemy of Richard; the capture in the spring of 1179 of Taillebourg, a formidable citadel perched on the summit of a hill, was Richard's first great military exploit and laid the foundation of his fame as a soldier. Geoffrey de Lusignan also was a bitter opponent ever since the annexation to the ducal domain of La Marche which Geoffrey claimed was his by inheritance.

In the last verse (v. 32) of this strophe, *homenes* is not to be rendered by 'homage' (Thomas), but by 'land,' 'territory,' with Chabaneau (*Rev. langues rom.*, xxxiii, p. 202), or by 'Lehen,' with Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.).

11, 33-36

Entre Perteus e la Isla-Bochart
E Mirabel e Laudu e Chino,
35 A Clarasvals an bastit ses regart
Un bel chaslar e mes en pla chambo.

Of the various chroniclers who mention the erection by Richard of a castle at Clairvaux, on territory forming part of Young Henry's heritage, Robert de Torigni or du Mont (ed. Delisle, II, p. 115) and G. de Vigeois (ed. Labbe, p. 333) place the event at the end of 1182. The *Gesta* (ed. Stubbs, I, p. 294) and Diceto (II, p. 18) give no precise date. There is good reason for believing that the date specified by G. de Vigeois and

by Robert de Torigni is correct, as on January 1, 1183, so the *Gesta* (I, pp. 294-5) inform us, Richard, when admonished by his father on the subject of Clairvaux, freely made over to him the castle to dispose of it according to his good pleasure. It would seem to follow that the present *sirventes* was written at the very end of the year 1182, after the erection of Clairvaux by Richard and before Richard had surrendered it to the elder Henry, or at all events not long after. But it is of course possible (and this should be borne in mind in attempting to assign a date to any of his compositions relating to contemporary history) that the news did not reach Bertran's home for some time, or that he feigned to ignore the surrender of Clairvaux by Richard so as not to be deprived of so excellent an opportunity of fanning the elder brother's jealousy of the greater independence granted to the younger by their father.

(To be continued.)

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

THE INFLUENCE OF VICTOR HUGO ON SPANISH POETRY AND PROSE FICTION

IN an earlier article¹, we surveyed the vogue of Victor Hugo in Spain, noting in particular its late beginning, its brilliant, though fiercely contested, period of glory, and the brevity of its duration. We now enter upon a discussion of his influence upon the three *genres* chiefly represented in Spain during what is vaguely known as the 'Romantic' period. In this article we shall deal with poetry and prose fiction; in the next, with drama.

I.

Spanish critics who have written of Victor Hugo's influence on the lyric poetry of Spain appear to us to have greatly exaggerated it. We can find no foundation in fact for Juan Martínez Villergas' assertion: 'Tan pronto como se popularizaron en España las inimitables orientales de Victor Hugo, todo el mundo hizo orientales²,' for Juan Valera's generalisation: 'Líricos del gusto francés acaso puedan llamarse nuestros románticos, llenos de imitaciones de Victor Hugo, de Lamartine y de Musset³,' or for the statement of a usually careful historian, Sr Salcedo Ruiz: 'La influencia de Victor Hugo sobre los literatos españoles de la península y Ultramar, sólo puede definirse bien con la palabra fascinación. Apenas había poeta del período romántico que no le tradujese y ninguno que no le imitase⁴.'

We have already shown how the first collection (1822) and the second (1826) of Victor Hugo's *Odes*, and the *Orientales* (1829), went for years almost unheeded in Spain⁵. Only an investigator who has spent weeks on end among the literary reviews of the eighteen-twenties and eighteen-thirties can realise how extremely slight was the influence in Spain of those first collections of poetry. Not only is a translation or close imitation of one of the *Odes* or *Orientales* the very rarest *trouvaille*, but it is

¹ *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 1932, xxvii, pp. 36-57. The subject is studied 'chiefly between the important years 1830 and 1845,' though we go beyond the latter limit where there seems good reason.

² *Juicio crítico de los poetas españoles contemporáneos*, Paris, 1854, p. 189.

³ *La Metafísica y la Poesía*, Polémica por Don R. de Campoamor y Don J. Valera, Madrid, 1891, p. 121. For the very slight influence of Lamartine on Spanish poetry, see E. Allison Peers: 'The Fortunes of Lamartine in Spain,' in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 1922, xxxvii, pp. 458-65. The influence of Musset was apparently so slight that there is insufficient material even for a short article upon the subject.

⁴ *Historia de la literatura española*, Madrid, 1917, iv, p. 562.

⁵ *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 1932, xxvii, pp. 37-9.

unusual for anyone who is familiar with these works to come across thoughts and turns of phrase which appear to be indebted to them. Nor can the later collections—the *Feuilles d'Automne* (1831), the *Chants du Crépuscule* (1835), the *Voix Intérieures* (1837) and the rest—be said to have been received any better, though these three were all published during the period of Hugo's greatest influence. Such translations and imitations as we have discovered will be noted below. Till a much greater number can be found it must be asserted that Hugo's direct influence on Spanish poetry was small.

The reasons for this are not altogether clear. The most important seems to be that, in the period with which we are dealing, Hugo was a lyricist rather than a narrative poet; and, while nineteenth-century narrative poetry developed early in Spain, lyric poetry remained almost untouched by the Romantic movement until about 1840¹. This is a fact to which little attention has been drawn in the past; it will be developed in some detail in a full-length study on Spanish Romanticism which Professor Allison Peers has in preparation. Here it must suffice to say that the early nineteenth century considered the art of poetry to have taken, with the Salamancan School, a 'rapid and lofty flight,' and that, in consequence, it 'left little to be desired,' Meléndez Valdés and Quintana having 'given it a new perfection².' Men who so believed were the lineal descendants of men who had accepted Luzán's claim to have revived poetry by formulating rules for it: it is hardly to be wondered at if they were deaf to the blandishments of Victor Hugo or blind to the real beauties of the Romantic lyric. Not till about 1837, when Zorrilla published his *Poesías*, did it become clear that much was lacking in Spanish poetry; not till after the appearance of Espronceda's *Estudiante de Salamanca* (1839) came an outburst which had in it at least something of true poetry.

During the period of preparation, however, as well as in the more enlightened eighteen-forties, it is indubitable that Victor Hugo's influence was felt with some force indirectly. While no quantitative or qualitative analysis of this influence is possible, it may safely be said that it affected the substance of Spanish poetry considerably less than its form. We have already learned enough of the reception of *Hernani*³ to understand why the 'belles vieilles villes d'Espagne...où vous trouvez tout⁴' of the

¹ In the year 1840 alone were published the *Poesías líricas* of Espronceda, the *Poesías* of Pastor Díaz, the *Ensayos poéticos* of S. Bermúdez de Castro, the *Ternezas y Flores* of Campoamor, the *Poesías caballerescas y orientales* of Arolas, the *Poesías* of García Gutiérrez, the *Leyendas Españolas* of Mora, and many other collections too numerous to name.

² The quotations are from Cosca Vayo's *Ensayos Poéticos* (1826).

³ *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 1932, xxvii, pp. 36-57, *passim*.

⁴ Preface to *Les Orientales*.

Orientales failed to attract the Spaniards, and Hugo's later poems, in which he reveals his innermost feelings, have little in common with the Spanish temperament, though we believe that here he has strongly influenced one living poet, Enrique Díez-Canedo. In form, on the other hand, he probably taught the Spanish Romantics a good deal¹. Though his earliest prefaces devoted no attention to questions of metric², the poems which they introduced were examples of metrical freedom more potent than precept. They must have been read, re-read, recited and imitated by scores of the Spanish *emigrados*, and their melody cannot have escaped unconscious reproduction. Thus, to take one example, we cannot formally prove that the rhythmical echoes of Hugo's *ballade* entitled *La Chasse du Burgrave*:

Daigne protéger notre chasse,
 Châsse
 De monseigneur saint Godefroi,
 Roi !
 Si tu fais ce que je désire,
 Sire,
 Nous t'édifierons un tombeau
 Beau ;
 Puis je te donne un cor d'ivoire,
 Voiie
 Un dais neuf à pans de velours
 Lourds...³

inspired a *letrilla* of Bretón's with its punning end-rhymes:

i.....
 Más nieve que en el Moncayo
 Cayó !
 i.....
 Yo idilios, yo cantinelas...
 Helás !

 Que de quitarme de en medio
 Me dió.
 i.....
 Me han privado de sus lastres
 Las tres !⁴

But we can be fairly sure that Hugo was indirectly, if not directly, responsible for Bretón's indulgence in such pranks of versification—that Bretón read Hugo even if his wife did not⁵.

This—and many more cases could be cited—is surely genuine influence: the fact that Romero Larrañaga, Salvador Bermúdez de Castro and others

¹ See, for example, the poem 'El Pescador' in *El Artista*, 1835, I, p. 5. This is clearly written as an exercise in metric.

² Cf. the 1828 preface to the *Odes et Ballades*.

³ *Odes et Ballades*, Ballade XI.

⁴ Bretón de los Herreros, *Obras*, Madrid, 1883-4, v, p. 219.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, p. x.

wrote poems called 'Orientales' because the title was in fashion is surely nothing of the kind.

II.

Having given due weight to this type of influence, which, though difficult to analyse, is quite evidently of importance, we now pass to consider what debts to Hugo, if any, were incurred by the principal poets of the Romantic period in Spain. Rivas, it may be said with something approaching certainty, owed hardly anything to Hugo, save as a dramatist. As a lyric poet he was never completely emancipated from the eighteenth century; although he occasionally escaped for a brief space, he returned to the cage incontinently. His narrative poems entitled *Romances históricos* follow the Spanish tradition, and his *Leyendas* owe something to Romantic versification, but more, we fancy, to Espronceda than to Hugo. Only the *Moro Expósito*, begun in 1829 and published in 1834, might well show a more direct influence.

Just as Alcalá Galiano, however, in writing the preface to the *Moro Expósito*¹, reveals traces of having been influenced by Hugo, but such slight ones that no certainty is possible, so Rivas' debts in the poem itself must be considered problematic. His lavish use of colour and his love of antithesis, for instance, remind one of the *Orientales*—yet the colour sense was certainly well developed in him from his earliest days², and he was a painter in other media than words. We do not think that any passage in the poem or any of its traits can be alleged as being without any doubt due to Hugo.

Zorrilla, coming to maturity a quarter of a century later than Rivas, was naturally more directly exposed to Hugo's influence at the most impressionable period of his life. Hugo, Dumas and Chateaubriand were among the favourite authors of his boyhood³, and as a young man he translated two of the *Orientales*: 'Chanson de Pirates'⁴ and 'Le Voile'⁵. The latter is the freer of the two, the former being an almost exact trans-

¹ E.g., the disclaimer on behalf of Rivas ('No ha pretendido hacerlo clásico ni romántico, divisiones arbitrarias en cuya existencia no cree') seems to be suggested by Hugo's preface to his *Nouvelles Odes* (1824): '(L'auteur) répudie tous ces termes de convention que les partis se rejettent réciproquement... Pour lui, il ignore profondément ce que c'est que le genre classique et que le genre romantique.' Cf. also the resemblances suggested in E. Allison Peers, *Rivas, a Critical Study*, New York, Paris, 1923, pp. 216-20.

² Cf. E. Allison Peers, *Rivas and Romanticism in Spain*, Liverpool, 1923, pp. 59-61.

³ *Recuerdos del Tiempo Viejo*, Barcelona, 1880, p. 21 (cf. Zorrilla's anecdote about his clerical uncle and Hugo, p. 20). We think, however, that Blanco García (*La Literatura Española en el Siglo XIX*, Madrid, 1909, I, p. 198) is exaggerating as much as the critics quoted on p. 50 when he says that Zorrilla '(comenzó) desde luego a figurar entre los poetas idólatras de Víctor Hugo.'

⁴ Zorrilla, *Obras completas*, Madrid, 1905, I, p. 107.

⁵ Zorrilla, *op. cit.*, I, p. 159.

lation in very similar metre. The subject of Zorrilla's *Oriental* entitled 'Dueña de la negra toca'¹ is reminiscent of Hugo's 'Lazarra,' though the metre is more conventionally Spanish and the language is somewhat less florid². Once more, although the two poems differ in subject, the form of Zorrilla's *Oriental* 'De la luna'³ corresponds to Hugo's 'Sara la baigneuse'⁴; 'La Azucena Silvestre'⁵ corresponds metrically, too, to Hugo's *Orientale* 'Les Djinns'⁶. It cannot be said, however, that there are any striking general resemblances between Zorrilla's verse at this period and Hugo's *Orientales*. Despite Zorrilla's evident interest in Hugo as an artist, his not dissimilar profuse employment of words to hide lack of thought and his markedly optimistic temperament, he differs from Hugo both in avoiding most of the latter's favourite themes and also in seeking to tell a story rather than, like Hugo, to paint a dazzling picture. Far from seeing in Zorrilla, as Martínez Villergas does, a writer who is continually 'parodying' Victor Hugo till he becomes his 'shadow'⁷, it seems to us that, the older he grew, the farther Zorrilla departed from his early model. Sr Díez-Canedo, with his customary insight and felicity, has perceived and aptly expressed the true relation between Zorrilla and Hugo:

Hasta cuando en sus primeras poesías imitaba a Victor Hugo, era español sin mezcla. Lo que hacía era restituir a su lengua y a su patria reminiscencias que de ella pasaron al autor del *Hernani*. Por Zorrilla se anuda la cadena que enlaza la oriental

¹ Zorrilla, *op. cit.*, I, p. 37.

² Cf., for example, two parallel stanzas:

Diera alfombras orientales
Y armaduras y pebetes,
Y diera... ¡que tanto vales!
Hasta cuarenta jinetes.
Il eût donné sa housse et son large étrier;
Donné tous ses trésors avec le trésorier,
Donné ses trois cents concubines;
Donné ses chiens de chasse aux colliers de vermeil,
Donné ses Albanais, brûlés par le soleil,
Avec leurs longues carabines.

³ Cf. Zorrilla, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 109-10.

⁴ *Orientales*, XIX. Two stanzas may be quoted:

De la luna a los reflejos
A lo lejos
Árabe torre se ve;
En el agua de Darro, pura,
Bate oscura
Del muro el lóbrego pic.
Sara, belle d'indolence,
Se balance
Dans un hamac, au-dessus
D'un bassin, d'une fontaine
Toute pleine,
D'eau puisée à l'Ilyssus.

⁵ Zorrilla, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 479-514.

⁶ *Orientales*, XXVIII.

⁷ Zorrilla, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 267.

Victorhuguesca al romance morisco. En la parte morisca, en Granada y en algunos trozos de Gnomos y mujeres, resuena todavía un eco de las orientales, y, con todo ello, españolas son a más no poder...¹

Espronceda, the most potent lyricist of the Romantic period in Spain, was very little influenced by Victor Hugo, though he must have come frequently into his orbit during his years in Paris. The fact is that the two had little in common. Espronceda was influenced chiefly by Byron, who exercised less attraction upon Hugo than upon certain of the latter's contemporaries. There is no *mal du siècle*, no *desengaño* in Hugo's early poetry as there is in Byron and in Espronceda.

It is impossible but that Espronceda, the master of so many verse forms, should have learned some at least of them from Victor Hugo: the curiously graded metrical scheme of 'Les Djinns,' for example, will be found in *El Estudiante de Salamanca*². But only one of Espronceda's poems seems to depend directly upon Victor Hugo in subject—'El Reo de Muerte,' which may have been influenced by the novel *Le Dernier Jour d'un Condamné*. On the other hand both 'El Canto del Cosaco' and 'El Mendigo' are inspired by two poems of Béranger's ('Chant du Cosaque' and 'Les Gueux'), so that Hugo is not the only poet to influence Espronceda's subjects³.

¹ On Zorrilla's imitations of Hugo, the following criticism (from *La Paz*, No. 184) is an interesting commentary: 'Se procura persuadir (en el prólogo) que "no es la poesía de que se trata imitación de Hugo o de Lamartine." ¿No? Pues ¿por qué esa insufrible repetición del artículo indefinido tan mal visto de nuestra lengua y abominado de nuestra poesía? ¿Por qué estas frases que se quedan tan en francés como se concibieran por la primera vez aunque con palabras españolas? ¿Por qué esa abundancia de brujas, espectros, fantasmas que nos ha arregalado la moderna literatura francesa?'

...Pero volvamos al principio fundamental del arte. No debe impedirse a nadie que imite: pues es una verdad harto desconocida en nuestros días que "el que no imite jamás será digno de ser imitado." Imite en buen hora, y aun traduzca nuestro poeta, los trozos o las composiciones que le parezcan excelentes, de Byron, de Hugo y de Lamartine; pero imíteles o tradúzcales en español, no las deje en su lengua nativa: busque frases castellanas con que expresar los pensamientos nuevos, y sobre todo expréselos con claridad, porque nada se perdona menos que oír voces a las cuales no corresponden ningún sentido: y a ningún poeta se les juzga por lo que sea o lo que sienta, sino por lo que exprese.'

² 'Les Djinns' (*Orientales*, xxviii) has stanzas of 3-2, 4-3, 5-4, 6-5, 7-6, 8-7, 9-8, 11-10, 9-8, 8-7, 7-6, 6-5, 5-4, 4-3, 3-2 syllables respectively and successively. Espronceda's scheme is less appropriate to the sense of the poem and more complicated. The gradation begins at the line 'Fúnebre,' ends at 'Son' and comprises a stretch of some 300 lines (1385-1680). The scheme is analysed in Professor G. T. Northup's edition of *El Estudiante de Salamanca* (Boston, 1919, pp. lxx-lxvi) and need not therefore be described in detail here.

³ Foulché-Delbosc has pointed out that the last line of Espronceda's 'Canto a Teresa' contains an idea which had been expressed by Victor Hugo some years previously (*Revue Hispanique*, 1909, xxi, p. 669):

Que haya un cadaver más, ¿qué importa al mundo?

Mais moi, sous chaque jour courbant plus bas ma tête,

Je passe, et, refroidi sous ce soleil joyeux,

Je m'en irai bientôt, au milieu de la fête,

Sans que rien manque au monde, immense et radieux.

(*Feuilles d'Automne*, xxxv, 'Soleils couchants,' vi.)

We do not, however, ourselves believe that this similarity is more than a coincidence.

III.

The most direct influence of Victor Hugo's poetry is to be found in two of the minor lyricists of Spanish Romanticism, a fact from which the reader may make his own deductions. Both were, as a matter of fact, particularly sensitive to foreign inspiration and to both Hugo serves as but one of many models. Neither was of great significance to posterity; though they absorbed more, therefore, than Zorrilla or Espronceda, they probably handed down less.

Juan Arolas has been studied in some detail by Sr Lomba y Pedraja¹, who has examined the question of his indebtedness to France, and in particular to Victor Hugo and to Lamartine. For Hugo he professed the greatest admiration, his temperamentally erratic judgment hardly pausing 'on this side idolatry.' Piling up images, he compares Hugo's voice to the wandering cloud in the sapphire sky, to the first bright star that shines and the last that dies, to the rose rocked by the breeze. Nay, more:

Es la gota del rocío,
Es aroma del clavel,
Llanto fiel
En un rostro de jazmín,
Suspiro del amor mío,
La calma del corazón,
El pincel de la ilusión,
La risa de un serafín. . . .

And the heavens declare Hugo to be immortal:

¡Oh, cielos! si disteis fieles
A Victor Hugo el honor,
Ceded para nuestro amor
Dos hojas de sus laureles.
Yo perdí la luz en tanto
De la rutilante luna,
Ví eclipsarse mi fortuna
Y el ave no dió su canto.
Mucho pretendes, oí:
Ese genio es celestial;
¡Infeliz! tú eres mortal. . .
Cantarás sus glorias, sí².

In the *Orientales* of Arolas we find not only parallels to Hugo's brilliant descriptions but also poems adapted and freely translated. 'El Robo de los Piratas³' is adapted from 'Chanson de Pirates⁴', it bears the same epigraph but enlarges upon its original. Less evidently, but noticeably, 'O, qué triste está el Sultán!' is based upon 'La douleur du Pacha⁵' and

¹ *El poeta Arolas, su vida y sus versos*, Estudio crítico, Madrid, 1898.

² *Poetas*, Valencia, 1879, II, p. 117.

³ Arolas, *Poetas Caballerescas y Orientales*, Valencia, 1840.

⁴ Hugo, *Orientales*, VIII.

⁵ *Ibid.*, VII.

'Los celos de la Sultana' upon 'La Sultane Favorite'¹. 'La Nube' was certainly inspired by 'Le Feu du Ciel'². there is little verbal or formal resemblance between the poems, but their main idea is too striking to have occurred to two men independently in such detail. Sr Lomba also quotes a number of isolated passages from Arolas which are either translations or echoes of Victor Hugo³.

The second minor poet to absorb Victor Hugo is Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda⁴. The significance of this absorption is small, as there were few contemporary poets of the first rank in Western Europe from whom she failed to take something. Her poem 'Los Duendes' is an imitation of 'Les Djinns'⁵, the treatment of which varies from free translation to markedly original elaboration. A detailed comparison of the two poems reveals greater skill on the part of La Avellaneda than is sometimes credited to her: it would make a brief survey of this kind, however, disproportionately long. La Avellaneda also translated three of Hugo's poems: 'Le Poète,' 'Polonia' and 'La Tombe dit à la Rose'⁶. Her 'Canción,' described as an imitation of Hugo, is really a free translation⁷.

Among the numerous other minor poets whose works we have examined, a fair proportion—notably Ochoa, Mora and Pastor Díaz—owe an occasional idea to Victor Hugo, sometimes acknowledging it, sometimes not. It is only upon those whom we have here treated, however, that he seems to have left any real impression.

IV.

Small as, by comparison with his expectations, the investigator may consider the influence of Victor Hugo on lyric poetry in Spain, he will find that the results yielded by a study of Spanish prose fiction in relation to Hugo's influence are still fewer. The principal reason for this is, of course, the lack of vitality shown by Spanish novelists before Fernán Caballero wrote *La Gaviota*, in 1849—we might even say before Juan Valera, with his *Pepita Jiménez* (1874), led the way in that grand revival and triumph of prose fiction in Spain which is not completely past even to-day. French novels, either in the original or in translation, were read freely in Spain during the first half of the nineteenth century. Where

¹ *Ibid.*, XII.

² *Ibid.*, I.

³ Cf. Lomba y Pedraja, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

⁴ *Obras literarias*, Madrid, 1869, vol. I.

⁵ Hugo, *Orientales*, XXVIII; Gómez de Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Madrid, 1869, I, pp. 42-6.

⁶ Gómez de Avellaneda, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 60-3, 75-6, 92. Cf. *La Alhambra*, 1840, p. 264.

⁷ Gómez de Avellaneda, *op. cit.*, I, p. 154; *Chants du Crépuscule*, XXIII.

so-called original Spanish novels were produced, they proved very often to be little more than adaptations of Scott or some other foreign author¹.

But even of the French novelists who succeeded in penetrating beyond the Pyrenees, Hugo was by no means the chief, except, possibly, for a few years when he was at the height of his vogue. Mesonero Romanos, in warning his contemporaries against the 'poisoned pens of the Hugos and the Dumas, of Balzac, Sand and Soulié²,' certainly puts Hugo first. But this phrase was written in 1838. Compare with it an article in *El Clamor Público* (September 28, 1850), which describes how the French novel served as a basis for the novels of Spain and other countries. 'Alejandro Dumas,' writes the author, 'este colosal novelista, cuyo nombre es repetido sin cesar . . . , ha elevado la novela a una altura y la ha dado una popularidad de que antes carecía. Victor Hugo, Eugenio Sué, Paul Féval, Federico Soulié, Jorge Sand, Paul de Koch, Balzac y otros, quizá superiores a Dumas en profundidad y filosofía, si bien muy inferiores en facilidad, han contribuido también poderosamente a inclinar y fomentar el gusto por esta clase de lectura, que en algunas personas, y principalmente en los jóvenes, ha llegado a rayar en verdadero frenesí³.' Here a contemporary witness gives us some idea of the relative importance which he attached to the chief French novelists who were known in Spain: Dumas comes easily first, and Hugo, though the first to be mentioned after Dumas, is hardly more than one of the rest. A critic who writes somewhat later, J. M. Asensio y Toledo, after describing Hugo's influence, goes on to say that Soulié, Sand, Dumas, Musset, Koch and Féval grew to be as well known in Spain as in France⁴: 'Momentos hubo en que se concedió por el vulgo la supremacía y se proclamaba como el mayor de los novelistas a Eugenio Sué⁵.' 'También daba acogida el periódico en sus folletines,' writes another critic, 'a novelas, por caso general traducidas de propaganda humanitaria y socialista a la manera de aquel famoso Judío Errante, que alcanzó, en su país y en el nuestro, popularidad aun mayor que las mismas producciones de Dumas o de Victor Hugo⁶.'

These quotations suggest what in fact we believe to be the case—that,

¹ Examples will be found in E. Allison Peers, 'Studies in the Influence of Sir Walter Scott in Spain,' in *Revista Hispánica*, 1926, LXVIII, pp. 1-160. One example of a similar imitation of Hugo is treated in the text of this article. Space forbids us to enter farther into the general question; Miss Parker has in preparation a study of the Romantic historical novel in Spain which will treat it in greater detail.

² *Semanario Pintoresco*, 1838, p. 255.

³ Cf. B. M. Araque, *Biografía del Señor D. W. Ayguals de Izco*, Madrid, 1851, p. 54 n.

⁴ *Fernán Caballero y la Novela Contemporánea*, Madrid, 1893, p. 38.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁶ *Ateneo Científico, Literario y Artístico: La España del Siglo XIX*, Madrid, 1882, II, p. 302.

at any rate after 1840, the two French novelists who had the greatest influence in Spain were Dumas and Sue¹. The influence of the latter, especially, was prolonged by his followers and imitators Juan Martínez Villergas, Rafael del Castillo and Wenceslao Ayguals de Izco, and is certainly more extensive than would be justified by his intrinsic merits. Until these questions have been examined in detail, however, it would be premature to generalise; it must suffice to say that both Dumas and Sue played a greater part in the undistinguished history of the Spanish novel at this time than did Hugo.

Asensio y Toledo, in his survey of the Spanish novel, gives Hugo a place apart, in words which must be judged in the light of our previous article. 'Comunicando a sus relatos,' he says of him, 'toda la poesía de su ardiente imaginación, llegó con *Nuestra Señora de París* a hacerse una especie de ídolo entre los lectores, colocándose en el más alto grado de popularidad. Ninguna de sus obras despertó ni aun remotamente tan grande interés².' We believe this judgment to be somewhat exaggerated, but it undoubtedly contains this amount of truth, that whatever influence Hugo's novels did in fact have in Spain was due practically wholly to *Notre Dame de Paris*. Indeed, we have found no trace of the direct influence of any other novel that he wrote.

Quite apart from what we have already said in a general way of the vogue of Hugo's novels, we may grant that *Notre Dame de Paris* was received in Spain with something more than interest—perhaps with a portion of the *asombro* with which that country had greeted his drama *Lucrece Borgia*³. Some, it seems, spoke of it contemptuously: '¿Qué no se ha dicho de *Notre Dame de Paris*? Con harto trabajo se le concede algún talento, alguna poesía al autor de lo que se llama un delirio⁴.' But others spoke of it with wonder: '...*Notre Dame de Paris*, creación original y para nosotros gigantesca, que...ofrece a la admiración del filósofo algunos caracteres pintados con una profundidad y al mismo tiempo una valentía extraordinaria⁵.' Another opinion, this time not of the original

¹ One more interesting external testimony to the ascendancy of Dumas and Sue is provided by the Paris correspondent of *El Balcón Musical* for 1846. Where is Hugo in this notice? 'La novela anunciada la semana pasada, y de la que ya empieza a hablar ventajosamente en los salones, se titula *La femme de soixante ans*, es original de Balzac, cada día más apreciado en Francia como literato, a pesar de que en España le hayan olvidado algún tanto por Sue y Dumas. Aquí en esta parte son más justos y menos exclusivistas; aquí no se leen las novelas porque los nombres de los autores se pongan en moda, y los de los tres literatos referidos se elevan a la misma altura: como novelista por supuesto, pues, como autor dramático, Dumas les lleva a ambos inmensa ventaja.'

² *Op. cit.*, p. 38.

³ Cf. *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxvii, p. 42.

⁴ 'C. A.' in *El Artista*, 1835, i, p. 95.

⁵ 'C. A.,' *ibid.*, p. 41.

but of one of the translations, may also be quoted. The *Constitucional*, in 1840, reports thus:

Mucho puede decirse en elogio de una obra salida de la pluma de Victor Hugo y reputada la mejor de sus composiciones, pero todos saben que es su autor el primer genio romántico del día y esto basta a hacer inútil cualquier alabanza. Hablando pues sencillamente de esta novela por el efecto que en nosotros ha producido su simple lectura, diremos que es de un género nuevo y original, fantástico y sublime. El fecundo talento de Walter Scott descubrió en la historia y costumbres de la edad media inagotable manantial de bellezas poéticas, y abrió a los sucesivos novelistas un campo inmenso que cultivar, del cual la moderna literatura empieza a coger los más opimos frutos. Una prueba de ello es *Nuestra Señora de París*¹.

One solitary adaptation did *Notre Dame de Paris* bring forth, one sole instance in which Victor Hugo received from Spain that compliment of barefaced imitation which so often fell to Scott. López Soler's *La Catedral de Sevilla*, written in 1834, is little more than an abridged translation from the French². Both novels have the same opening; López Soler describes the preparations in Seville for the entrance of the ambassadors of Pedro de Aragón, and the consequent celebrations, just as Hugo describes the festivities in Paris in preparation for the coming of the Flemish ambassadors. The following typical passage shows how closely the Spanish novelist kept to the original:

Ya se comprende en fuerza de estas preliminares que no era cosa fácil penetrar en aquel vasto salón, ni aun en la desproporcionada plaza que llamaban del alcázar. Presentaba su imperfecto círculo a la multitud de personas asomadas en las ventanas, el cuadro de un ancho golfo al que cinco o seis calles, que en nuestra discreta comparación deben semejarse a otros tantos nos le rendían en innumerables testas el tributo de sus ondas.

Ce n'était pas chose aisée de pénétrer ce jour-là dans cette grand'salle, réputée cependant alors la plus grande enceinte ouverte qui fût au monde. (Il est vrai que Sauval n'avait pas encore mesuré la grand'salle du château de Montargis.) La place du Palais, encombrée de peuple, offrait aux curieux des fenêtres l'aspect d'une mer

¹ *El Constitucional*, Feb. 17, 1840, p. 260. Cf. our Bibliography, No. 17 a, and *El Heraldo*, July 19, 1840.

² As is shown, quite independently of internal testimony, by the following notice (*Diario de Barcelona*, November 24, 1834) which treats its publication chiefly as a means of making Hugo more widely read:

La Catedral de Sevilla, novela formada sobre la que escribió en francés Victor Hugo con el título de *Notre Dame de Paris*. Tres tomos en 8vo. Habiendo llegado a poder del editor de la colección de novelas históricas, originales españolas, el manuscrito de la citada obra, trabajado por un literato distinguido y apreciado del público, creyó desde luego que no debía titubear un momento en su publicación, tanto por dar a conocer en España un libro que, según la opinión de nuestro primer lírico moderno, es el que con más talento se ha escrito en nuestros tiempos, cuanto porque la imitación de que se trata conserva en toda su fuerza y brillantez las bellezas del original. El editor sin embargo no creyó digno de su legalidad y buena fe imprimirla como parte integrante de su colección que está publicando, por carecer esta novela de la cualidad de original que, según ofreció, debe distinguir a las demás: así que ha determinado publicarla independiente de dicha colección y por suscripción separada. Los que gusten suscribirse podrán acudir a la librería de Piferrer, plaza del Angel. Las dos novelas de la colección publicadas hasta el día, tituladas *El Primogénito de Albuquerque* y *El Doncel de D. Enrique el Doliente*, se hallan venales en la citada librería a 36 rs. en rústica.

dans laquelle cinq ou six rues, comme autant d'embouchures de fleuves, dégorgeaient à chaque instant de nouveaux flots de têtes.

The Spanish novel is very much shorter than the French, two chapters of the former corresponding usually to five of the latter. But although López Soler omits various scenes of Hugo's novel, he adds no new ones of his own. He gives the same titles to his chapters as Hugo does; and the Christian names of his characters are the same, although their surnames differ. Thus Pierre Gringoire is called Pedro Nebrija in the Spanish version; Miguel Giborne, Miguel Chaparro; and the Djali, Galis.

In our forthcoming investigations among the minor historical novels of this period it is possible that some new material may come to light. For the present we can only record with surprise the unique nature of López Soler's novel. Hugo as a novelist was widely enough read in Spain, but he certainly was not imitated. He amused, and even instructed, but he certainly did not inspire.

ADELAIDE PARKER.

E. ALLISON PEERS.

LIVERPOOL.

SOME POINTS OF CONTACT BETWEEN WOLFRAM VON ESCHENBACH AND GERBERT DE MONTREUIL

THE continuation by Gerbert de Montreuil of the *Contes del Graal* contains one adventure which, on investigation, shows a few slight but significant points of contact with the *Parzival* of Wolfram von Eschenbach, to be precise, with just those sections in which Parzival meets Sigune. In drawing attention to this, I may say that, so far as I am aware, the resemblances have not yet been traced; at least, I have come across no reference to them.

The episode in question¹ concerns the Damsel of the Horse-bier and the Knight of the Dragon, characters which appear also in *Perlesvaus*, and may be condensed as follows.

Perceval, as he rides through a waste country, meets a lady driving a car draped with cloth of gold; the corpse of her lover, blackened and charred with fire, lies beneath the pall. She is seeking someone to avenge his death, and has visited all his kin, only to find that none of them dares do battle against his foe. With unrelenting will she urges the horses forward. She wears her garments reversed in sign of mourning, and has sworn to eat no flesh, to drink no wine until her revenge be taken on him 'who of no man has dread or fear' ('qui ne crient ne doute nului'). This redoubtable foe is the Knight of the Dragon, so called because of the devil-enchanted device on his shield, a dragon's head casting flames of fire from its jaws. In this way many knights have been cruelly slain, until now there are none left so hardy as to confront that terror. Of the many victims the lady's knight was one. Meeting Perceval, she knows by the Cross on his shield that here is the pre-destined victor: against him the might of the devil shall not prevail. Perceval agrees to do combat, and the Damsel shows him the way to Montesclaire, where the Dragon Knight is at war with the queen of the land, 'la Pucele au Cercle d'Or'.² In the fight which follows, Perceval, rendered immune by the sacred emblem, destroys the devil's enchantment and mortally wounds the Knight of the Dragon who, deprived of this supernatural aid, meets his doom at last. Then the Damsel whose knight was slain sees her vengeance fulfilled, and is content.

¹ Gerbert de Montreuil, *Continuation de Perceval*, éd. par Mary Williams, Paris, 1925, vv. 8906-10192.

² The account of the siege of Montesclaire tallies so markedly with that of the siege of Beaurepaire in Crestien's *Perceval* as to suggest a deliberate and close imitation of this by Gerbert. The adventure itself goes back to an allusion in the speech of Crestien's *pucele laide*, and was evidently meant to be carried out by Gauvain.

She buries her lover first, then retires to spend the rest of her days in prayer and penance, in a hermitage by a lonely spring, shut in by desolate mountain and wild forest. No other desire is left in her than to serve God humbly and to pray for her lover's soul.

The resemblances strike one directly. The Damsel of the Horse-bier is very like Wolfram's Sigune. And although the events are different, so different as to exclude all question here of a source superseding the work of Crestien, yet certain features are relevant to the theme. What they indicate is a second, casual line of relation between Sigune, Schionatulanter, Orlus, those three, and, on the other hand, the three similar figures of Gerbert's tale, the Damsel, the dead knight, and the Knight of the Dragon.

There is, of course, no direct connexion between Wolfram and Gerbert. That, on chronological grounds, must be ruled out, unless one is rash enough to endorse the astonishing last views of A. Schreiber¹. No sane critic can. We must in this case assume a lost earlier source, from which Gerbert's tale is derived.

It is the Damsel of the Car who, first and last, rivets our attention and gives us cause to think. It is as though we had met Sigune's twin. That the abstract situation is similar does not count: a woman making lament for her murdered mate: we might multiply that figure a thousand times. It is the same situation in Crestien's poem² where, in point of fact, the external setting, the place in the story, and the trend of the conversation between the bereaved damsel and Perceval show unmistakably the raw material on which Wolfram worked, while the main course of Gerbert's account is different. It is the intensity of the conception which grips us here. The Damsel of the Car is not, like Crestien's damsel, a mere decorative type, but a personality rooted in love and sorrow.

To illustrate this, we must quote verbatim. The meeting between Perceval and the Damsel is described as follows:

Pensant est un val avalez,
entrez est en gaste contree.
Lors a une dame encontree
qui molt tres grant dolor demaine.
La damoisele un char amaine
qui d'un drap d'or estoit covers.
La pucele avoit a envers
ses draps vestus et sa chemise.
Durement s'estoit entremise
des chevas semondre et chachier
qui sont au char, car porchachier

¹ *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, LXV, pp. 14 ff.

² Vv. 3428-3690 in the recently published edition of Crestien's *Contes del Graal* by Alfons Hilka, Halle, M. Niemeyer.

velt la vengeance son ami.
 Passé a deus mois et demi
 qu'ele ot en tele maniere erré.
 Il sembloit que dedans un ré
 eust esté ars ses amis,
 qui par dedens le char fu mis,
 que piez, jambes, quisses et ventre
 avoit ars, al mien escientre;
 tresci par deseure le chant
 l'avoit li fus ars et ataint;
 tains et noirs fu tot l'aparent.
 Li chevalier n'avoit parent
 ou la dame ne l'ait mené.
 Tozdis a son doel demoné
 par che qu'il n'osent paine metre
 ne de lui vengier entremetre,
 car il n'en venroient a chief.
 La pucele a torné son chief
 et son vis par devers le char:
 voé ot que jamais de char
 ne mangera por nul endroit,
 ne vestira ses dras a droit
 ja mais, ne de vin ne bevra
 devant a ce qu'ele avra
 esté vengie de celui
 qui ne crient ne doute nului,
 par cui ses amis estoit mors
 qui plus estoit noirs qu'uns Mors:
 tout la ou li fus ot ataint
 l'avoit tout noirchi et taint.

And these are the Damsel's own words:

'Ochis a mon tres cher ami
 par l'escu qui art et esclaire...
 amours et pitiez me remort
 por mon ami, si ai voé
 que ja mais en tout mon aé
 n'ierent vestu mi drap a droit,
 autrement qu'il sont orendroit,
 mais tout si con sui atornee
 serai devant le char tornee
 et menrai as cors por mostrer
 mon ami tant que encontre
 porrai celui par qui vengiez
 ert mes amis que l'enragiez
 m'a ocis si orriblement.'

The language, more matter-of-fact than Wolfram's, is nevertheless sincere, and reveals the same austere passion of grief and undivided will which characterise Sigune. The aim is different, the spirit in which it is pursued the same. Sigune's revenge is directed against herself. Taking the affinity for what it is worth, we have next to consider a point of more factual value.

The part of the 'Chevalier au Dragon,' while carried to greater extremes

of barbarity and violence, is similar in type to that of Orilus de Lalant, as expressed by Wolfram and as indicated by Crestien.

Crestien's damsel does not name the slayer, but she points out the way he has gone, and since, by taking that route, Perceval immediately encounters him who is called 'li Orgueilleus de la Lande,' it is easy to guess who was meant by

li chevaliers fel e estouz
qui me toh mon ami douz,

and to see in him the same person as

li Orgueilleus de la Lande
qui autre chose ne demande
se bataille non e meslee.

The identification comes out clear in the prose *Perceval*, where we are introduced to a weeping damsel, whose knight has been slain by a certain 'Lord of the Tent' named Orgoillos Delandes. Perceval promises to avenge the knight's death, overcomes Orgoillos in combat, and sends him a prisoner to Arthur's court. Wolfram is equally explicit: Sigune tells Parzival who slew her knight, though she will not let him risk his life to avenge him:

Junc vlætlic suezer man,
die gebruoder hânt dir vil getân.
zwei lant nam dir Lahelîn.
disen ritter unt den veterî dîn
ze tjostiern sluoc Orilus.
der hez ouch mich in jâmer sus. (Parz., 141, 5-10)

The point of contact with Gerbert's story is that, when Parzival finally meets Orilus and does combat with him, the device worn by the latter actually *is* a dragon:

ûf des schilde vander
emen trachen als er lebte.
ein ander trache strebte
ûf sîme helme gebunden;
an den selben stunden
manec guldîn trache kleine
(mit manegem edelen steine
muosen die gehêret sîn:
ir ougen wâren rubîn)
ûf der decke unt ame kursît. (262, 4-13)

There is nothing of this in Crestien's story. The description recalls the Knight of the Dragon, and in fact forms a very apt parallel to Gerbert's lurid account of the deadly shield. We can see, then, what possibly lay behind Wolfram's fantastical description of Orilus' arms, how in rationalising the older, naïve conception of a dragon-headed shield spouting flames of fire, he humorously aspired to match it, making the toy dragon

seem rampantly alive, mating it with a second equally fierce, and multiplying their brood:

ûf des schulde vander
einen trachen als er lebte.
ein ander trache strebte
ûf sîme helme gebunden...

The burlesque is continued:

pris gedient hie Parzivâl,
daz er sich alsus weren kan
wol hundert trachen unt eines man.
ein trache wart versêret,
sîne wunden gemêret,
der ûf Orilus helme lac.

(263, 14-19)

The picture is ironically apt. For Orilus de Lalant is a man who imagines himself to be overpowering. The display of dragons expresses him rather well.

The vivacity remains, the irony subsides and gives place to a kindlier tone in the charming description of Cunneware's tent, where the sister of Orilus makes him loyally welcome:

Jeschûten unt ir amîs
vrou Cunnewâre de Lalant
dannen fuorte sâ zehant.
einhalb an des kuneges rînc,
uber eins prunnen ursprinc
stuont ir poulûn ûf dem plân,
als oben ein trache in sînen klân
hets ganzen apfels halben teil.
den trachen zugen vier wintseil,
reht alser lebendic da flûge
untz poulûn gegen den luften zûge.
dâ bî erkandez Orilus,
wan sîniu wâpen wâren sus.
er wart entwâpent drunde.
sîn sueziu swester kunde
im beiten êre unt gemach.

(278, 8-23)

There is very likely some recollection in this of the tent described by Crestien, 'qui estoit li plus biaux del monde,' and of the figure at the apex, a red shining eagle catching the sun's rays:

Li trez fu biaux a grant mervoille:
l'une partie fu vermoille
et l'autre verz, d'orfois bandee;
desus ot une aigle dorce;
en l'aigle feroit li solauz,
qui mout luisoit cler et vermauz,
sî reluisoient tuit li pré
de l'enluminemant del tré.

(639-646)

So much for Orilus. The third stage of our comparison brings us back to Sigune, with stronger proof of the ultimate bond between her and the

bereaved Damsel of Gerbert's tale. For here, in conclusion, is something more than a similarity which, after all, might be due to chance: the recorded facts are the same. Both, turning their backs on the world, retire to live out the rest of their days in anchorite seclusion. Of both we are told that they had lost colour and strength; and that the chosen retreat was a little lone hermitage beside a spring, in the heart of a great forest. There is, however, this difference: the Damsel buries her lover first, and with all due ceremony, 'a l'abeie saint Sozplis,' before burying herself in the wilds; Sigune keeps her lover's coffin interred beside her, in the cell where she lives.

This, at all events, is Gerbert's ending:

...la pucele vers la porte
de Montesclaire son char amaine
qu'ele ot mené mainte semaine;
de mener n'est pas esmarie.
En la porte entre et tant charie
son char qu'a l'abeie vient;
son ami issi qu'il covient
fist a grant honor enterrer;
ne volt plus gaires demorer,
ains s'en part et tot adez pleure.
Tant va qu'al bos de Claradeure
est venue en une montaigne
qui molt est horrible et estraigne;
la trove une gaste chapele
et dalez une fontenele,
et si ot un viez habitacle.
Uns hermites, c'ot non Heracle,
i avoit mes plus de cent ans;
mors fu n'avoit mie lonc tans.
Iluec est la bele arestee
qui assez tost ot degastee
sa colour qu'ot clere et vermeille;
et ce ne fu mie merveille
qu'ele ot al oré et au vent
et s'a poi a mengier sovent,
et ce doit bien color changier.
N'a fors rachines a mengier,
pomes salvages et faine
et glant que quelt par le gaudine;
n'a de nule autre chose envie.
Ensi usa toute sa vie,
par son ami fist penitance.
Jesus destort de mescheance
celes qui aiment loialment
et lor doinst bon definement,
que ceste ama bien de cuer fin
et si servi Dieu en la fin.

The legend of the Gral is so fraught with conflicting likelihoods that, in dealing with a particular case, all one can do is to state the evidence

and deduce the results most probable. So in the case before us, if from Gerbert's tale we exclude, as secondary, the siege of Montesclaire with its heroine, the 'Pucele au Cercle d'Or,' there remains a story abstractly perfect, so simple and logical that we need waste no labour in reconstructing its source. New details were probably added; the religious sentiment was perhaps more heavily stressed; otherwise, it seems almost certain that the lines of the earlier tale were left unaltered.

Assuming, then, for Gerbert and Gerbert's source, this virtual identity of subject, one is led to a threefold conclusion. First, that Wolfram still owes Crestien a tangible debt, which remains unchallenged. Secondly, that the tradition which Gerbert used, in whatever way known, gave him a few ideas. Thirdly, that he imagined the tale anew and independently moulded it to his mind, gathering in with the rest another element from an unknown source, the pursuit of the hound with the coveted leash which brings disaster¹. This last is in fact the determining point of the story conceived by Wolfram. The forerunner of Gerbert could have given him more—supplied what in Crestien's account is so signally missing, a central motive—one which, rightly handled, has never failed to appeal, the old-world tragic theme of a woman's grief and vengeance for her beloved. Wolfram, following a different path, evades the more elemental tragedy of love and hate, discovering a subtler anguish than this in Sigune's remorse for her own folly. For if Orilus slew her lover, the ultimate cause of his death was the hound's leash, which she besought him to bring her.

Ein bracken seil gap im den pîn.
In unser zweier dienst den tût
hat er bejagt und jâmers nôt
mir nâch sîner minne.
Ich hete kranke sinne
daz ich im niht minne gap.

(141, 16-21)

With this, the *Rachemotiv* is no longer needed. In any case, no place remained for it when from the single over-packed scene which Crestien gives us two new scenes were evolved, the first of them falling within the period of Parzival's green boyhood. To have let young Parzival do as he offered, ride after the slayer and wreak vengeance on him, would have deflected the tale from its first objective, the arrival of the boy hero in Arthur's court. The exigency of the plot works hand-in-hand with the exigency of Sigune's part, in which self-accusing remorse is the dominant factor. How could she, who had sent one young man to his death,

¹ This, on the evidence pointed out by Heinzel and Singer, would also lie within the cycle of the Grail legend.

jeopardise the life of another? Hence, in contrast to Crestien's damsel, she does not show which path the slayer has taken, but deliberately points out the wrong way:

Sî wîste in unrehte nâch.
 si vorht daz er sîn leben verlur
 unt daz sî grœzern schaden kur.

From Sigune we learn that Orilus was Lahelin's brother, and that the wrong done to her was the latest act in a war of aggression waged by both together.

Junc vlætıc suezer man,
 die gebruoder hânt dir vil getân.
 zwei lant nam dir Lahelîn:
 disen ritter unt den veteru dîn
 ze tjostiern sluoc Orilus.
 der liez ouch mich in jâmer sus.

This relationship is the less likely to have been invented by Wolfram, since it is confirmed by more than one branch of the Perceval legend. The closest parallel is that of *Perlesvaus*: here Chaos the Red, brother to the Red Knight whom Perceval slew, is leagued with the Lord of the Moors in war against the mother of Perceval, the Widow Lady. The part assigned to the Lord of the Moors resembles Lâhelîn's: it is he who opens the war of invasion and reaves the Widow Lady of the Valleys of Camelot, just as Lâhelîn seizes Norgals and Waleis. A more shadowy value attaches itself to the parallel from Gerbert: the Knight of the Dragon is brother to King Maragon, and that is all¹. But it seems a typical trait of the Perceval legend for the enemy knights to be leagued together as allies or related as brothers.

Turning from Wolfram to Crestien de Troyes, we find a strange medley. The damsel whom Perceval meets after leaving the Grail Castle plays two incongruous parts: an inconclusive rôle of her own as mourner for the dead knight whose headless corpse lies in her lap, and a superimposed rôle as mouthpiece for the information required to clear up the events preceding. These two parts are mechanically joined: there is no inter-fusion, no psychological unity in the damsel herself, and no sense of any quickening contact between her and Perceval. That she is his cousin

¹ King Maragon appears in another episode of the *Contes del Graal*, in the section ascribed to Pseudo-Waucher (Potvin, 38137-38492). The rôle he plays here is similar to that of the Knight of the Dragon. For just as the Damsel of the Circle of Gold is besieged by the Knight of the Dragon and delivered by Perceval, and just as her will to resist is stiffened by the death of a young knight whom her foe has murdered, so, under similar circumstances, another damsel is besieged by King Maragon and delivered by Gauvain. There is a faint reflection of that type of situation in Wolfram's account of the siege of Pelrapeire, into which he introduces the death of Condwiramurs' young cousin Schenteffurs (see especially 194, 27-195, 3).

serves to explain her knowledge of him and his mother, and of his mother's death, and has no further value. The entire scene is recklessly ill-composed. Between two outbreaks of grief, pitched in a key which is mournful and tender enough to be sincere, comes a passionless, long, practical chain of leading questions and explanations, nominally the concern of Perceval, who, however, remains so unimpressed as to leave no doubt of their ulterior aim. They are simply a means devised to inform the audience! There is not a shred of drama in all this, behind a semblance of liveliness there is no live spirit. Yet here are the elements which Wolfram used in shaping Sigune's story, the disjointed dry bones which he knit together, and infused with the breath of life and clothed with beauty. There is no doubt of the fullness of that creative act, and if to Crestien's medley we add those few elements derived from other sources, the coherency of Wolfram's perfectly built story impresses us all the more.

We have next to ask why, for the mere sake of conveying information, did Crestien introduce this pathetic figure, the bereaved mourner whose grief, so far as his tale is concerned, is so plainly wasted? And I think it is hardly possible to decide whether Crestien here reproduced what he found in his source, without betterment, or whether he himself is to blame for having stifled a simple live episode with matter extraneous to it. But at least we may assume a stage antecedent, if not immediately so, to Crestien's work, when the bereaved damsel played an unfettered part. And since, in Crestien's rendering, this older theme is no longer alive and remains as a mere decorative piece of setting, we need not suppose that he troubled to change its details.

It can soon be reconstructed in outline. Perceval finds a damsel seated under a tree lamenting her lover's death. The headless trunk of the dead man lies on her lap or beside her: it is evident that he has not been killed in fair fight but foully murdered. 'Li Orgueilleus de la Lande' is the name of him who committed that savage act, a manifest felon whose name matches the deed. Perceval, following a track which the damsel points out, rides after the slayer and overthrows him in combat. Whether he kills him outright and avenges the dead man thoroughly, or accepts his surrender and sends him a prisoner to Arthur's court, one cannot say, but at least, the stronger ending best fits the crime. The tale was similar in type to that which Gerbert tells of the Knight of the Dragon, and actually underwent the same kind of expansion: that is, a second lady was introduced who finally usurped the place of the first. This, in Gerbert's tale, is the Damsel of the Circlet of Gold. Her position here is secondary to that of the other Damsel, 'la pucele qui ot non Claire, qui el char maine

son ami': without her, the story would lose a picturesque inset but would sacrifice nothing of its essential form. A later stage is shown in *Perlesvaus*. The positions here are reversed: the Damsel of the Circlet of Gold is the more important figure. The Damsel of the Horse-bier remains and still plies her ancient task, seeking a champion to avenge the dead, but it is no longer on her own account she does so. It is for the sake of her lady, the Queen of the Circlet of Gold, 'who loved him of passing great love with all her might.' The one figure has gained, the other has lost, by the change. The passionate mourner of Gerbert's tale has stiffened into the strangely dutiful part of the mere attendant, who seems to have no feelings and no detached will of her own. 'Sir...on this level plot was slain your uncle's son whom here I leave, for I have brought him far enough. Now avenge him as best you may, I render and give him over to you, for so much have I done herein that none have right to blame me¹.'

So in the other case also. The part of the mourning damsel was balked of its ending when, to heighten the interest, another lady was introduced, the shamefully ill-used, long-suffering, and loyal mistress of the 'Orgueilleus de la Lande.' So it came, that the fight to avenge the wrongs of the one served rather to rectify the cause of the other lady. Exactly the same stage has been reached in Crestien's version as can be discovered in *Perlesvaus*: a comparison of the latter with Gerbert's account is instructive, as illustrating the gradual way such changes are made. Other questions remain, which one cannot at present make any attempt to solve. Did Crestien identify the felon knight's mistress with the lady of the tent, whom young Perceval deprived of her ring? Was it he who made the bereaved damsel Perceval's cousin, and sacrificed what was left of her earlier part to the onerous task of supplying information? Or had all this been done before him?

How loose the connexion is between those two mechanically joined parts can be seen from the prose *Perceval*, where they are found separated. The damsel whose knight is slain by Orgoillos Delandes and avenged by Perceval is introduced the first day of the hero's adventures, and is quite distinct from the damsel whom he meets later, and who tells him about the Grail. This can hardly mean that the prose *Perceval*, in most other respects a hotch-potch of known ingredients, has preserved the original separate identities of the two. Rather, it shows the natural disintegration of a loosely formed union. Of the treatment in *Peredur* we may say the same.

¹ From the English translation of Sebastian Evans.

Secondary, also, in relation to earlier sources, is *Perlesvaus*¹. The episode of the 'Chevalier au Dragon' contains, however, a few points omitted by Gerbert which may well be primitive. Thence we can infer four stages in the development of the theme.

(1) A simple story with three actors, Perceval, the Damsel of the Car, and the Knight of the Dragon.

(2) An expansion of this, containing a new episode, the siege of Montesclaire, and a new character, the Damsel of the Circlet of Gold, hitherto associated with the adventures of Gauvain.

(3) Derived from (2), with a few small omissions and changes; Gerbert's version.

(4) Derived also from (2), but further removed, and giving the first place to the younger heroine; the version contained in *Perlesvaus*.

Of the younger heroine, the Damsel of the Circlet of Gold, we read in *Perlesvaus* that she made her lover's body to be embalmed when the Knight of the Dragon had slain him. This, transferred to the other Damsel, forms another link between her and Wolfram's Sigune, of whom we know that 'ein gebalsemt riter tât lent ir zwischenn armen.' That in the first place. Secondly, there is word of a personal bond between the dead knight and his avenger: the former is identified as Alein, son of Elinant of Escavalon, Perceval's uncle on his father's side, and the obligation due to this nearness in blood is firmly stressed. Comparable with this is the bond, not of kinship but of fealty, between Parzival and his ill-starred liegeman, Schionatulander, of whom Sigune says, that his loyalty wrought his undoing. He was slain in thy service, she tells young Parzival:

Dirre furste was durch dich erslagen,
wand er dîn lant ie werte:
sîn triwe er me verscherte...
in unser zweier dienste den tât
hât er bejagt, unt jâmers nôt
mir nâch sîner minnen.

Yet a third point, in which *Perlesvaus* seems to have kept closer to the earlier form. According to Gerbert, the Cross on Perceval's shield, opposed to his enemy's, causes the devil so housed to fly forth in the shape of a huge black crow, accompanied by a clap of thunder. After a period of amazement, the fight is resumed, but the enemy has lost his advantage and the end is certain. The 'Chevalier au Dragon' at length falls mortally wounded, living just long enough to confess his sins to a priest and save his soul. This somewhat excessive streak of piety is, in

¹ As was pointed out by W. Nitze, *Perlesvaus, A Study of the Sources*, 1903.

all probability, Gerbert's own; there is no such mitigation in *Perlesvaus*, where the Knight of the Dragon comes to a deserved and fearful end. 'Perceval seeth the Dragon's head, that was long and broad and horrible, and aimeth with his sword and thrusteth it up to the hilt into the gullet as straight as ever he may, and the head of the Dragon hurleth forth a cry so huge that forest and fell resound thereof as far as two leagues Welsh. The Dragon's head turneth it towards his lord in great wrath. and scorcheth him and burneth him to dust, and thereafter departeth up to the sky like lightning.'

The priority of this more drastic ending, probable in itself, is confirmed by parallels from the romance of Apollonius of Tyre, which many years ago found a niche among the researches of Singer. At this distance in time, it seems preferable to quote verbatim. Beginning with the *Apolloniusroman* of Heinrich von Neustadt, Singer, it will be remembered, traced this to an earlier, more primitive source, the antecedents of which were in turn linked up with the 'Sage vom babylonischen Reich,' this with an Oriental branch of the *Gralsage*¹:

Als Apollonius sich Antiochia naht, reitet ihm ein Ritter entgegen: *Er flouc dort her durch den wint, als er wæc des tuvels chint. . . Er fuort ein trachenhoubet ouf dem helm gepunden. Oben unde unden was sin decke alliu swarz, reht als ein gepantez harz. Sin schilt was von golde geslagen, als er scholde daz swarze trachenhoubet daran.* Es ist Taharcus, der Marschall des Antiochus. Apollonius hingegen fuhr die Sirene im Wappen. Er sticht den Gegner beim zweiten Waffengang vom Pferde. Dasz als Gegner des Helden hier Taliarcus erscheint, ist vom Dichter gut erfunden, um die spätere Feindschaft der beiden zu erklären. Im französischen Prosaroman der Wiener Hofbibliothek ist es ein ungenannter *chevalier ardant*. Dort kommt Apollonius auf dem Wege zu Antiochus nach Gresse, dessen König Alexander ihn gegen den feindlichen Ritter schickt, der auf einer Insel *regnaît par l'art du deable*. Er fuhr einen feuerspeienden Drachen im Schilde. Apollonius gelingt es, den Drachen selbst zu verwunden, da wendet sich dieser gegen seinen eignen Herrn und verbrennt ihn.

Using the foregoing in so far as it is relevant to the subject in hand, we may note that the 'Chevalier ardant,' 'der auf einer Insel *regnaît par l'art du deable*,' is clearly identical with the 'Chevalier au Dragon,' who in like manner rules godlessly over an island realm and, in *Perlesvaus*, meets with the same unhallowed end. At what point in the history of these two similar episodes the supernatural aspect became transmuted is a problem someone else may solve. Critics of Singer's persuasion would certainly ascribe the change to Kiot, and explain the parallels from Wolfram and from Heinrich von Neustadt as emanating from a common source. It is, however, quite conceivable that, without literary precedent, rationalisation may have occurred twice over, through association with the facts of real life. The popularity of the dragon as an heraldic emblem

¹ *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, XLIV, pp. 332 ff.

is sufficiently attested by Geoffrey de Vinsauf in his description of Cœur de Lion's advance from Ascalon: 'Then might you have seen many a banner and pennon floating in the breeze, many a mother's son, people of various nations, arms of various shape, and helmets with crests, brilliant with jewels, and shining mails, and shields, emblazoned with lions or flying dragons in gold.'

The matter may rest here. For when all is said, the assumed indirect relation between Wolfram and Gerbert depends far less on the Knight of the Dragon than on the figure opposed to him, the Damsel with the Car. The resemblances here are closer and more definite. Subsequent researches may bring to light a stronger likeness elsewhere, and discover a more convincing theory of relation. Even so, there remains an affinity of conception which, if casual, is no less striking. Among the many conventionally drawn heroines of the *Contes del Graal*, Gerbert's mourning Damsel stands out by virtue of her sincere passion of grief and unswerving purpose, and is worthy of a place not far from Sigune's side. And one other quality is theirs in common: the heart-felt gratitude of those who, in the hour of uttermost need, have found a friend.

Got lône dir, daz dich dô sô rou
mîn vriunt, der mir zer tjosst lac tot,

Sigune says to Parzival; and the words in which Gerbert's Damsel bids her champion farewell, though they lack that master touch of perfect nature, are yet true and tender.

...Gentius hom, va a Dieu !
Vengiec m'as du mal faidieu
qui mon ami m'avoit ochis,
qui gist el char de fu noirchis
et qui du drap d'or est covers.
Mes dras que j'avoie a envers
vestus, mais jes ai orendroit
vestus et par defors l'endroit;
mes veus est par vous acomplis.
A l'abeie saint Sozphs
qui est el chastel la pucele
au Cercle d'Or, qui tant est bele,
ferai mon ami enfour
Ou que soit m'en irai furr
ou en bos ou en liu salvage;
iluec ferai un hermitage,
si prieraï por mon ami,
et a la feie por mi,
et por vous especiaument
que Dieus par son comandement
honor et joie vous otroit
et il en tel liu vous avoit
ou vous truissiez vostre désir.

MARGARET F. RICHEY.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE 'EXETER BOOK.'

1. *The Fates of Men*, 43 f.

Sum[ne] on bæle sceal brondas þencan
fretan frecne lig fægne monnan.

The scribe seems to have made three mistakes in these two lines. To obtain any sense we must change *lif* to *lig*, and the nominative *sum* to the accusative *sumne*. The phrase *brondas þencan* is also clearly corrupt. Emendations already suggested are *brondas þeccan* (Thorpe), *brond aþengan* (Grein), and *brond aþecgan* (Sedgefield). The only objection to *brondas þeccan* (which recurs in line 47) is the singular verb *sceal*. It appears to me that the emendation which requires least disturbance of the actual reading of the text is *brond aswencan*. The scribe may merely have confused the two very similar letters þ and ƿ (*w*). The verb *swencan* is common in the sense of 'to afflict,' and *aswencan* is found in religious prose with the same meaning 'In a conflagration flame shall attack another, cruel fire shall devour the doomed man.'

2. *The Fates of Men*, 80 ff.

Sum sceal mid hearpan æt his hlaforðes
fotum sittan feoh ƿicgan
ond a snellice snere wræstan
lætæn scralletan gearo se þe hleapeð
nægl neome cende biþ him neod micel.

Grein's emendation of the unintelligible *nægl neome cende* to *nægl neomegende*, 'the ringing nail,' has been accepted by all subsequent editors. The lack of sense and of alliteration shows that *gearo* in the preceding line is also corrupt. A word with the meaning 'plectrum,' equivalent to *nægl*, is clearly required. I suggest *sceacol* (N.E. shackle), since this is found as a translation of *plectrum* in Old English glosses of Latin. Lines 84, 85 would then run,

lætæn scralletan sceaco[ʒ] se þe hleapeð
nægl neomegende biþ him neod micel,

'let the leaping plectrum, the ringing nail, shrill loudly; great is his eagerness.'

3. *Gnomic Verses*, 172 ff.

earm biþ se þe sceal ana lifgan
wineleas wunian hafaþ him wyrd geteod
betre him wære ƿæt he broƿor ahte begen hi anes monnes
eorle[s] eaforan wæran gif hi sceoldan efor onginnan
oppe begen beran biþ ƿæt shiphende deor.

'Wretched is he who must live alone; fate has ordained him to remain friendless. It would be better for him that he had a brother, and that they both were the sons of the same man, if they should attack a boar, or both of them a bear—that is a beast with cruel paws' In the last line all editors have read *slippherde*, 'cruel,' and some have emended to *sliphearde*. But the MS. has quite clearly *sliphende*; compare *idelhende*, 'empty-handed,' *Beowulf*, 2081. A vivid compound has thus been lost from the Old English vocabulary.

4. *Gnomic Verses*, 177 ff.

a scyle þa rincas gerædan lædan
 ond him tosomne swefan
 næfre hy mon to mon to mædle
 ær hy deað todæle.

The MS. reading in the third line is clearly corrupt. Sense can be obtained if we read:

næfre hy mon todo to mædle
 ær hy deað todæle,

'never let them be separated at an assembly until death part them.'

5. *Riddle 3*, 1 ff.

hwilum mec min frea fæste genearwað
 sendeð þonne under salwonge
 bearm bradan ond on bid wriceð

Line 3 *a* is metrically insufficient. Tupper, in his edition of the *Riddles*, follows Holthausen in reading *bearm þone bradan*, 'sends my broad bosom under the fertile earth.' It appears to me that much better sense can be obtained if we read *bearme bradan*, in apposition to *salwonge*. 'Sometimes my lord imprisons me fast, then sends me under the fertile earth, under its broad expanse.' Compare *Beowulf*, 1137, *ða wæs fæger foldan bearm*.

6. *Riddle 8*.

The runic letter for C stands above the first line of this Riddle, and is probably intended to indicate the solution. Tupper, p. 85, suggests that it may represent Latin *Cicuanus* or *Catanus*, both of which are translated by *higora* in Old English glosses of Latin. It is much more probable that the rune—the name of which is *Cen*—stands here for O.E. *ceo*, 'chough,' 'jackdaw.' A bird such as the jackdaw or magpie is clearly the subject of the Riddle.

7. *Riddle 31*, 3 f.

ic seah sellie ping singan on ræcede
 wiht was on werum on gemonge.

Line 4 *a* is clearly incomplete. Tupper follows Cosijn in emending to *wiht wæs nohwæpre werum on gemonge*. It seems more probable that the scribe has merely omitted a word between *on* and *werum*. The subject of the Riddle is the Bagpipe, so

wiht wæs on [wynne] werum on gemonge,

‘it was a joyful creature among men,’ would be quite appropriate.

8. *Riddle* 39, 18.

ne hafap hio blod ne ban hwæpre bearnum wearð
geond þisne middangeard mongum to frofre.

The change of *bearnum* to *beornum*, suggested by Wyatt in his edition of the *Riddles*, is unnecessary. *Bearn* in the sense of ‘children of men,’ ‘men,’ recurs in the Exeter Book poem *The Day of Judgment*, line 40.

9. *Riddle* 74.

IC swiftne geseah on swaþe feran
D N L H.

Most editors have assumed that the runic letter for *L* has here usurped the place of the runic letter for *U*, and that the Riddle is merely an easy anagram with the answer *Hund*, ‘dog.’ It is quite possible, however, that they have simply fallen into a trap set by the riddler, and that *DNLH* is really an anagram of the consonants of *Hælend*, ‘Saviour.’ ‘I saw, swift on the track, *HæLeND* travelling along,’ might then refer to Christ as a hunter in pursuit of sin.

10. *Riddle* 89.

The first two manuscript lines of the Latin Riddle run as follows:

Mirum uidetur mihi lupus ab agno tenetur. obcubu
it agnus. & capit uiscera lupidum starem etmisarē.

Now that the binding round the hole in the parchment has been removed it is clear that the last two letters of the first line are not *rr* but *bu*, so that the verb is not *obcurrit* but *obcubuit*. The first two metrical lines of the Riddle are therefore to be edited as follows:

Mirum mihi uidetur, lupus ab agno tenetur;
obcubuit agnus [*rupi*] & capit uiscera lupi.

‘The lamb has lain down on a rock’ is even more suitable than ‘The lamb runs to a rock’ as a reference to Matthew xvi, 18, ‘Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church.’

11. *Riddle* 93.

From what remains of this brief and damaged Riddle we can gather that it consisted of comparative statements, ‘I am higher than the

heavens,' etc. Tupper is almost certainly right in suggesting that it is a riddle upon the familiar 'Creation' or 'Nature' theme. Its first word, however, has been misread by all editors; it is not *Smiþ*, but *Smeþ* followed by the first down-stroke of an *r*. We may therefore assume that the Riddle began,

Smeþr[e ic eom þonne].

'I am smother than . . .'

12. *The Wonders of Creation*, 38 ff.

| | | | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|--------------------|
| hwæt [æt] | frympe | gescop | fæder ælmihtig |
| heah | hordes | weard | heofon ond eorðan |
| sæs | sidne | grund | sweotule gesceafte |
| pa nu | in þam | þrea[tu]m | þurh þeodnes hond |
| heap ond | hebbap | | þone halgan blæd. |

In line 38 a preposition has clearly been omitted before *frympe*, and, on account of the preceding *hwæt*, [æt] *frympe* is more probable than [on] *frympe*, the reading in Grein-Wulker. In line 41 *in þam þream*, 'in those afflictions,' gives very little sense, and the half-line is metrically irregular. Reading *þrea[tu]m*, we may translate lines 40 ff. as follows, 'the broad expanse of the sea, and the visible creatures who now in these multitudes, through the guidance of the Lord, exalt and extol His holy splendour.'

W. S. MACKIE.

CAPE TOWN.

PRINTED BOOKS WITH GABRIEL HARVEY'S AUTOGRAPH OR MS.

NOTES.

The following list is supplementary to those in *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia* (1913), pp. 80-6, 311, 312.

1507. Euripides. *Hecuba et Iphigenia in Aulide...in Latinum translatae; Erasmo Roterodamo interprete. Ejusdem ode de Laudibus Britanniae. Venetiis in Aedibus Aldi*. 8°. G.H.'s autograph and numerous critical notes. From the Pittar Collection. Belonged to Mr James Tregaskis, 66 Gt Russell St., W.C. (Catalogue 796, No. 163; 810, No. 164; 820, No. 160; 859, No. 141).

1527. Paulus Jovius. *Libellus de Legatione Basiliæ...principis Moschowiæ ad Clementem VIII.* Basileæ. G.H.'s autograph and monogram. Various notes, perhaps after 1578. Formerly at Ayscoughfee Hall, Spalding, in the library of Maurice Johnson. Now belongs to W. A. Marsden, Esq., Keeper of Printed Books, British Museum.

1532. T. Livius. *T. Livii Patavini Conciones cum argumentis et*

annotationibus Ioachimi Perionij. Parisijs. Apud Simonem Colinaeum. 8°. Contains notes by G.H. and the autographs both of Sir Thomas Smyth and of G.H. who obtained the book in 1578 after Sir Thomas's death 'ex dono C. [the page is here perhaps mutilated] Smithi.' Now in the Library of Worcester College, Oxford, bound with Ramus's *Ciceronianus*, 1557 (C.m.3).

1539. Frontinus. *The Strategemes*, trans. R. Morysine. G.H.'s autograph and notes. Formerly at Britwell Court, now in the Harvard University Library. See *Studies in Philology*, xxiii, p. 346.

1551. *Loci Communes*. No. 205 of the Harleian MS. 5991, contains as stated in *Marginalia* (p. 311) G.H.'s autograph and astrological notes. A similar MS. in his hand of 7 pp. forms No. 195 in the same Harl. MS. Probably it had also once belonged to the *Loci Communes* book.

1555. T. Livius. *Opera*. Basil. per Hervagios. fo. With G.H.'s autographs and copious notes. The book had been given him by Dr H. Harvey of Trinity Hall, 1568. Speaks of reading Livy with Preston of Trinity Hall, Queen Elizabeth's only paid scholar, and with Thomas Smith the younger, 'Collonel,' of Ardes, Ireland. Compares the efficacy as ambassadors of Sir Thomas Smith and Dr Dale, both devotees of Livy, with the less effective performances of Haddon and Wilson, both special admirers of Cæsar and Cicero. He eulogises Dr Dale for his high spirit in dealing with the Prince of Parma at the time of the Armada. England has no historian of Livy's order—Grafton, Holnshed and Stow are asses, better things from Camden and Hakluyt. He had been urged to study Livy by Sir Thomas Smith, Mr Ascham, Sidney and Bodin. Priced by Messrs Maggs in 1926 at £750.

1557. P. Ramus. *Ciceronianus*. Parisijs, Apud Andreæ Wechelium. 8°. G.H.'s autograph and notes. ('I redd over this Ciceronianus twice in twoo dayes, being then Sophister in Christes College.') In the Library of Worcester College, Oxford (C.m.3).

1561. William Thomas. [*The Historie of Italie*], running title *The Discription of Italy*. (Title-page missing.) Copious notes in G.H.'s hand. For history and ownership, see 1527 Paulus Jovius, with whose work this is bound.

1562. Aristotle. *Organon* (in Greek). Autographs and notes of G.H. Now in America. (Information kindly given me by Dr S. A. Tannenbaum of New York.)

1563. J. Sprengius. *Metamorphoses Ovidii...Enarrationibus...& Allegorijs Elegiaco versu...expositæ....* Francofurti apud Georgium Corvium, etc. G.H.'s autograph and some notes. Also 'Stephanus Jones,

Jan. 14^o, 1632, pr 3s. 8d.' (showing that some of Harvey's books were sold after his death in Feb. 1630/1). The book, which came from Wrest Park, was in the possession of Mr Ellis, 29 New Bond St., in March, 1922.

1567. T. Wilson. *The Arte of Rhetorike*.

1567. T. Wilson. *The Rule of Reason*. G.H.'s autographs and notes. Both now in the possession of Dr A. S. W. Rosenbach. (See *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxv, p. 327.)

1568. Sir T. Smith. *De recta linguæ anglicæ scriptione*. G.H.'s annotations. Britwell Court sale, March, 1927. No. 1829.

No date. (B.) Platina. *Hystoria de vitis pontificum*...recognita et nunc...integre impressa. Parisiis. Harvey's signature on title. Also 'Gabrielis Harveij liber emptus a Joanne Hutchinsono Pembrochiano.' Belonged to the late Dr F. J. H. Jenkinson, University Librarian, Cambridge.

[1572?] G. B[uchanan]. *Ane Detectioun of the dwinges of Marie Queene of Scottes*. Translated out of the Latine...written by G. B. No place or printer. G.H.'s autograph on title, and on the last leaf verso two passages in his hand from 'The King of Scotts in his new manuscript Instructions to his sonne Henrie.' (The Instructions appear in the *Basilikon Doron*, 1599.) Belonged to the late Mr W. A. White of New York and now in the Harvard University Library.

1575. J. T. Freigius. *Ciceromanus*...Basileæ per Sebastianum Henricpetri. G.H.'s autograph '4 Aprilis 1576' and copious notes. Now in the Library of Worcester College, Oxford, bound with Ramus's *Ciceronianus* (C.m.3).

1578. [*Florio has first Fruites...a perfect Introduction to the Italian and English Tongue*. Thomas Dawson.] Title-page missing. Copious notes in G.H.'s hand (no signature, but fo. 162 'Ad mnemosyna Gabrielis Harveij,' etc.). For ownership, see 1527, Paulus Jovius.

1581. S. Guazzo. *The Civile Conversation*.... Translated out of French by George Pettie. 4^o. Richard Watkins, London. On title-page 'Gabriel Haruey 1582.' Belonged to Mr Maggs, Conduit St., London, April, 1922.

1583. *Calendarium Gregorianum Perpetuum*. Antverpiæ Ex officina Chr. Plantini. G.H.'s autograph, '1583,' and notes. Now Peniarth MS. 526 in the Nat. Library of Wales, Aberystwyth.

(c. 1590?) *Most Rare and straunge Discourses of Amurathe the Turkish Emperour that nowe is*.... Written to a...lerned man of Germanie. Imprinted...for Thomas Hackett...in Lumberd-strecte under the Popes heade. For ownership, see 1527 Paulus Jovius, with whose work this is bound.

1607. *The Turkes Secretorie...translated...out of the Latine Copie*. Printed by M. B. On title 'gabrielis harveij, mense Maio 1607.' Some

brief notes. Belonged to W. A. White, Esq., now in Harvard University Library.

1613. Sir P. Sidney. *Arcadia*. This copy was in the Heber Library and lately belonged to W. A. White, Esq., who informed me as follows: 'The divisions into chapters and the contents of the chapters are copied from the edition of 1590, possibly with a view to a new edition. Harvey's notes end with the portion printed in 1590, except that on the first page, numbered 335, "Sr W. A." is filled out "lexander."' Now in Harvard University Library.

1618. John Napier of Merchistoun. *Description of the admirable Table of Logarithmes*. S. Waterson, London. G.H.'s autograph on title. No notes. Belonged in 1914 to S. Wesley, bookseller.

The following may be added to the list of books that once belonged to Richard Harvey:

1546. Petrarch. *De Remediis*. 16°. Paris. Autograph of R.H. on title and last page and several notes in his hand. Belonged to Mr Barnard, Tunbridge Wells (Catalogues of Oct. 1917 and May, 1919).

1555. D. Berengozius. *Opuscula*. Colonæ. Initials RH on title and various passages underlined. In the June 1925 catalogue (No. 45) of Mr Dobell, 8 Bruton St., W.1.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

A POSTSCRIPT TO 'SHORTHAND AND THE BAD SHAKESPEARE QUARTOS¹.'

In Miss Evelyn May Albright's *Dramatic Publication in England 1580-1640* (1927, p. 316), it is suggested that the same attention should be paid to Peter Bales's *Brachygraphy* in connexion with the bad Shakespeare quartos as has been given to Timothe Bright's *Characterie*. My rejection of *Brachygraphy* as impracticable may, therefore, have seemed too peremptory, and for this reason, and because it raises an interesting alternative to *Characterie*, I give the following particulars of Bales's system, taken from the unique copy of *The Writing Schoolemaster* (1590) in Lambeth Palace Library.

The basic signs are the ordinary Latin letters of the alphabet: about each letter could be placed four diacritical marks in any of twelve positions, thus giving 48 variants of each sign. To each variant was assigned a commonly used word, e.g.,

¹ *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxvii, July, 1932, pp. 243 ff.

| | | |
|------------|------------|-----------|
| à Also | .a Againe | a. Age |
| *a Abound | .a All | a. Ayer |
| *a Accept | a Although | a* Accuse |
| *a Advance | a Almost | a About. |

These words, about 530 in number, are almost all the same as Bright's *Charactericall* words.

To write any word other than Brachygraphy words, Bales prescribed the same synonym and antonym method as Bright adopted, a synonym being denoted by a small downstroke on the right side of the symbol and an antonym by a similar stroke on the left, 'or els, for the more suretie, you may set the first letter of the word.'

Comparisons, number and tense were left to the memory, 'taking onelie the present tence and singuler number.' Phrases were to be compressed: 'as for, he tooke his journey, he rode'; and repetitions were to be indicated by the letter *r* only.

A lengthy table is also given relating all the words in it to the appropriate Brachygraphy words: this table is a brazen plagiarism from Bright's Table of Appellative Words. In fact, the whole system, apart from the basic signs, gives point to Nashe's reference to:

Any such knavery, or Peter Bales Brachigraphy¹.

Mr W. J. Carlton also informs me that Bales's *New Year's Gift for England* (1600), of which he discovered the unique copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale, is not, as has been supposed, a new and improved system, but *Brachygraphy* with a new title-page. The system was, therefore, published three times, in 1590, 1597 and 1600.

In view of the little difference between Bright's and Bales's systems, it is difficult to understand why the latter should be regarded as impracticable and the former as fitted for reporting matter which would be difficult even with a modern shorthand. Bales's method of ordinary letters and diacritical marks would be very little slower than Bright's *Characterie* signs; these would certainly be easier to learn, and would probably not be much more confusing. The valid reasons for describing it as impracticable are the same as those which I previously advanced against *Characterie*.

It is important to notice, however—and this answers Miss Albright's demand—that, owing to the completeness of the plagiarism, almost every example that has been quoted as proof of the use of *Characterie* in pirating the quartos would have been produced by the use of Brachy-

¹ *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, ed. by R. B. McKerrow, 1910, I. 612.

graphy. On comparing the list of words which I quoted from Dewischeit, Friedrich and Pape with Bales's table, I found that in only three cases was the Brachygraphy word different from the Characterie word (i.e., 'crimes,' 'attend' and 'long' are represented by *offend*, *stay*, *desire*): and errors of tense, number, and pronouns, as well as abbreviation of phrases, would be similar.

I also stated previously that it might be worth while in connexion with the bad quartos to examine alphabetic shorthands, the earliest of which to be published were John Willis's and Edmond Willis's. Mr W. J. Carlton has recently purchased a manuscript containing eight sermons preached from 1599 to 1602 by Nicholas Felton, then Vicar of St Antholin's: the title-page states that they were 'taken from his mouth by . . .' (here is a blank caused by the complete scratching out of the reporter's name). The interesting question arises whether the reporter was Edmond Willis, who in the preface to his system, *An Abbreviation of Writing by Character* (1618), addressed to the same Nicholas Felton, at that time Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, stated that he had long practised reporting 'in taking many sermons from your Lordship's own mouth by the space of many years.' If the reporter were Edmond Willis, then, at the time of the publication of the bad quartos, there was in use a system of shorthand which might conceivably have been applied to verbatim reporting.

W. MATTHEWS.

LONDON.

S. T. COLERIDGE'S 'THE KNIGHT'S TOMB' AND 'YOUTH AND AGE.'

James Gillman is our authority for the statement that S. T. Coleridge surmised Scott's authorship of the Waverley novels through a quotation of a few lines from Coleridge's then unpublished fragment of the ballad, *The Knight's Tomb* (an experiment in metre he called it), which Scott had included in *Ivanhoe*, chap. VIII, published in 1820¹. The lines are:

The knights are dust,
And their good swords are rust;—
Their souls are with the saints, we trust.

Gillman furthermore says that the ballad was recited by Coleridge to 'a mutual friend' of his and Scott's, who later repeated it to Scott. In one of Coleridge's unpublished notebooks I find that this 'mutual friend'

¹ Scott used it again in *Castle Dangerous*, chap. IX.

must be J. H. Frere, as the following note so indicates that prefaces a slightly different version of this poem:

Mem.

The lines, which Mr. J. H. Frere, I surmise, must have repeated from memory to Sir W. Scott (for I had never committed them to paper) and which Sir Walter has in part cited in one of his Novels, is the first stanza of an intended Ballad, and should have been printed thus:

Where is the grave of Sir Arthur O'Relhan?
Where may the grave of that good man be?
By the marge of a spring, on the slope of Helvellan,
Under the twigs of a young birch tree.
The Oak that in Summer was sweet to hear,
And rustled th' leaves in the Fall of the year,
And whistled and moan'd in the Winter, alone,
Is gone! and the birch in its stead is grown.
The Knight's bones are dust, and his good sword rust;
His soul is with the Saints, I trust!

If the two published fragments are compared with this one, it will be observed that it is somewhat of a combination of the two. For convenience in comparison I shall give the varying lines in the version first published in 1834, and then the ones in the version which appeared fully quoted in the Notes to *Castle Dangerous* in 1834. (The lines are numbered.)

- A. 1. Where is the grave of Sir Arthur O'Kellyn?
3. By the side of a spring, on the breast of Helvellyn,
6. And rustled its leaves in the fall of the year,
7. And whistled and roared in the winter alone,
- B. 1. Where is the grave of Sir Arthur Orellan,—
3. By the marge of a brook, on the slope of Helvellyn,
6. That rustled in autumn all wither'd and sear,
7. That whistled and groan'd thro' the winter alone,

The same notebook contains a 'Fragment of the intended third stanza to *Youth and Age*,' as entitled by Coleridge. The final form of the poem appeared in 1834, and the lines that compare with this stanza are those from 39 to 49, or the last two stanzas. These lines were first published separately in *Blackwood's Magazine*, June, 1832, with the title 'An Old Man's Sigh: a Sonnet' as 'an out-slough or hypertrophic stanza of a certain poem called "Youth and Age."' The original publication of lines 1-38 was in the *Literary Souvenir*, 1828¹. The 'fragment' that Coleridge has in the notebook varies little from the published versions, but as this one has never been included with the others, I give it here, with the variants in italics:

iii

Dew drops are the Gems of Morning
But the Tears of mournful Eve:
Where no hope is, Life's a warning
That only serves to make us grieve,

¹ See *Poems of S. T. Coleridge*, edited by E. H. Coleridge, Oxford, 1924, p. 439, note.

With long leave taking!
In our old age!
With long leave taking, like a guest
 That may not rudely be dismiss'd
 Yet hath outstay'd...
caetera desunt

Coleridge adds this note to it:

But the poem formed a whole without it: and I must have either made a cheerless conclusion, or a religious one too elevated for the character of the Ode. But there is for *my* ear a sweetness in the movement of the first four lines that makes them worth writing down.

WARREN E. GIBBS.

NEW YORK.

FERNAM LOPEZ AND THE 'CRONICA DO CONDESTABRE.'

The judgment of learned critics appears to be setting against the attribution of the still anonymous *Cronica do Condestabre* to Fernam Lopez. It is not likely that there will ever be any actual proof. It is a question of probabilities, of chronology, of style. In the old and excellent periodical *O Instituto* (LXXXII, 1931, pp. 1-36) published by the Coimbra University Press, Professor Hernani Cidade has discussed the matter ably and at considerable length. Although none of his arguments may seem absolutely convincing, they have a certain cumulative effect. They are that the anonymous Chronicle, written before Lopez' Chronicles of King Ferdinand and King John, differs from them in style, having none of their Renaissance air, and, since it was written at earliest when Lopez was fifty, his style could not have altered to this extent in ten years; and that in using the anonymous Chronicle he corrected it as inaccurate and censured its lack of patriotism, censure such as no author would inflict on his own work. The style, the narrative, the atmosphere are all different.

As to the style opinions differ. 'The style of the two chronicles (*Cronica do Condestabre* and *Cronica de D. João*, I),' wrote the distinguished critic Snr Esteves Pereira, 'seems to me so similar as to belong to the same author¹.' On the other hand, Dr Mendes dos Remedios' description of the prose of the anonymous Chronicle reads like anything but a description of the prose of Fernam Lopez: the author, he remarks, never pauses to invoke the reader's attention or sympathy, nor attempts to surprise or emphasise². Yet one certainly seems to hear the authentic voice of Fernam Lopez, most individual and delightful of chroniclers, not in one passage only but on page after page of the anonymous Chronicle. There is

¹ *Boletim da Segunda Classe* (Academia das Ciencias de Lisboa), ix, 1915, p. 389.

² *Cronica do Condestabre*, ed. Mendes dos Remedios (Coimbra, 1911), p. xi.

the question of plagiarism. Professor Hernani Cidade has no difficulty in rebutting the contention of Snr Anselmo Braamcamp Freire¹ and Snr Esteves Pereira² that Lopez must either be the author of the Chronicle or the worst of plagiarists, since he inserts large slices of it in his later work without acknowledgment. It was the duty of the official chronicler to use, alter and improve the best material wherever he found it. Yet Professor Hernani Cidade seems to forget this official obligation when he asserts that no author would have censured his earlier work as Lopez censures the anonymous Chronicle. No *modern* author possibly. But the question of plagiarism on the part of Lopez cannot be quite lightly set aside. He declares that nothing was written of the Constable Nun' Alvarez during his lifetime, that is before the year 1431: 'em vida delle não foi alguia cousa escripto (*sic*)'.³ Fernam Lopez was then fifty. Did he wait for some pen of no mean capacity to write the life of the Constable and then incorporate it in his own chronicle? It is curious also that two works thus almost of the same date should so differ in style that a critic can assign one of them to the Middle Ages while regarding the other, that of Lopez, as savouring of the Renaissance. It might be possible to solve or diminish the difficulty by presuming that Lopez, in saying that nothing had been written before 1431, was not referring to his own earlier manuscript, and was indeed only referring to work of official chroniclers, his predecessors. The many passages in which he corrects the *Cronica do Condestabre* may only indicate⁴ that he had found better authorities to follow than those followed in his earlier work (the very fact of the existence of all these authorities seems to prove that something *had* been written, although nothing had been officially 'published'); while his altered outlook, authorities and style would be more easily explicable were he taking up and correcting a work written by himself years earlier, when he was not much over thirty. In his later style he became, perhaps naturally, more expansive and personal. Seventy-eight out of the eighty chapters of the *Cronica do Condestabre* cover the ground (with a few later interpolations) to the year 1415 only. Unless it be wholly impossible to limit Fernam Lopez' remark to the official 'publications' of the royal chroniclers, it may still be arguable that the *Cronica do Condestabre* is an earlier work by Lopez, written about 1415,

¹ *Primeira Parte da Cronica de D. João*, I (1915), p. xxv. The Coimbra University Press is about to publish the authentic text of Part II, edited by Professor Entwistle.

² *Boletim*, *ut supra*, p. 387. See also King Manuel II, *Livros Antigos Portuguezes*, II (1932), pp. 428-33.

³ *Cronica de Dom Joam*, Part I, cap. xxxi, ed. Braamcamp Freire, p. 56.

⁴ Cf. *Portuguese Literature* (Oxford, 1922), p. 85; and *Fernam Lopez* (Oxford, 1921), p. 30, Portuguese translation (1931), p. 35.

twenty years before his appointment to the post of official chronicler in March, 1434.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

MANIQUE DE BAIXO.

THE 'SPIEGELBUCH.'

Since the appearance of Rieger's edition¹ of the *Spiegelbuch* in 1871, this interesting work has been very much neglected by scholars. It is therefore gratifying to note that Dr Johannes Bolte has recently treated the subject in the *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*². This is an important contribution to our knowledge of the subject. To the three MSS. mentioned by Rieger, Dr Bolte adds five others and prints the text of two: F (in the St Gall MS. 985) and Z2 (in the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett) supplemented by readings from Z3. It is, however, unfortunate that he did not have an opportunity of consulting the unprinted Trier MS. (T2) or the Homburg version (H). He only knew the latter from Rieger's edition, which is far from being satisfactory.

Thanks to the kind assistance of Dr Kentenich, Director of the Trier Stadtbibliothek, I have succeeded in locating the unpublished MS. which Rieger was unable to find. It is in Codex No. 852 (pp. 339-51) of the Trier Stadtbibliothek, interpolated in the Cologne *Jahrbücher*. On p. 340 a modern hand has inserted the title 'Der Welt Lauf und der Sünden Fluch.' The MS. is not quite complete; one page is missing and several are torn. The text is closely allied to that of H. I have before me a rotograph of T2³, and I have collated the Homburg version with Rieger's text⁴.

A study of these documents throws much light on the evolution of the *Spiegelbuch* and the place of its origin. With regard to the first of these subjects Dr Bolte is quite emphatic: 'Die alemannische Mundart der ältesten und besten Handschrift weist uns nach dem Oberrhein.... Nach dem Oberrhein weist auch der Charakter der sorgfältigen Bilder, mit denen F geziert ist und die Nachricht, dass diese Handschrift ursprünglich dem ansehnlichen Klarissenkloster zu Freiburg i. Br. gehörte.' Dr Bolte is quite right in thinking that F was written in the region of the

¹ *Germania*, xvi, 185-211.

² Phil.-hist. Klasse, Hefte vi-viii, Berlin, 1932.

³ I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my deep indebtedness to Father Hanssen, of the Università Gregoriana in Rome, whose competent hands prepared this rotograph for me.

⁴ My thanks are due to H.H. the Grand Duke of Hessen for permission to consult the Homburg MS. and also to Graf Kuno von Hardenberg and Dr Adolf Schmidt, Landesbibliothekar in Darmstadt, for their valuable services in this connexion.

Upper Rhine and the miniatures may have been executed there, but does it follow that this was the home of the original? As it happens, F is neither the oldest nor the best version of the *Spiegelbuch*.

If we collate F and Z (the two texts edited by Dr Bolte) with H¹, what do we find? In numerous cases Z and H agree to the exclusion of F. A few examples will suffice:

Wie wolte ich den min zit vertriben (F 88).
 Wie mocht ich das immermer angetriben (Z 117).
 Wie mocht ich das ymerme angetryben (H 405).
 Ein kurtze froide und der enboren (F 109).
 Were es nit besser ein kurtze fröd enboren (Z 184).
 Were es nit beßer ein kortze freude enboren (H 426).
 Die ze lest lagend unden (F 122).
 Sy lagend aber alle des kriegs unden (Z 197).
 Sie lagen aber tzulest des krieges unden (H 439).
 Gedenck, das du ouch müst sterben (F 405).
 Wann du wirst auch gar kurzlich sterben (Z 494).
 Wann du wirst gar kurtzlich sterben (H 127).

On the other hand, cases of agreement of F and Z to the exclusion of H are negligible. The inference is obvious: Z cannot be derived from F, but it is possible that it may be derived from H. A collation of F and H proves conclusively that H is a much better MS. than F.

For H is the only MS. in a pure dialect. In orthography, phonology, accidence and syntax, it is typically West Middle German. T1 and T2 are both Middle Franconian mixed with Upper Franconian. Nor is F a homogeneous product. It contains Alemannic elements, such as *har* (*her*), *kilch* (*kirche*), *süfferlich* (*sauber*), *rechnig* (*rechnung*), *er het* (*er hat*), *mönsch* (*mensch*), *frömd* (*fremd*), *dort* (*dort*), *dörffest* (*dürftest*), *gon* and *ston* (*gen* and *sten*), the ending *-ent* in the first person plural. There is no trace of any of these peculiarities in the other MSS. But there are also Middle German characteristics in the St Gall MS., e.g., the retention of unaccented *e* in *ere*, *spise*, *grosse*, *ane*, *gelich*, *gesaget*, *enberen*, the use of *-en* in the 2nd and 3rd plur. pres. of verbs, the confusion of *u* and *o*, *i* and *e* (*fromer*, *fromkeit* for Upper German *frumer*, *frumkeit*; the rhymes *ist: lest*; *wirt: vert*; *lust: kost*)².

It is important to note that where F and H agree we have Franconian, but where F strikes out a line of its own, Alemannic appears. In F there are rhymes which are Middle German and not Upper German (*hinnen: findend*; *lust: kost*; *ist: lest*), but in other cases F has an Alemannic rhyme

¹ H is quoted with the actual reading of the MS.; numbers of lines according to Rieger.

² V. Demeter, *Die Kurmainzer Kanzleisprache*, pp. 51–52, 55–58 (Berlin Dissertation, 1916); Martin, *Untersuchungen zur rheinfränkischen Dialektgrenze*, pp. 67–69 (*Deutsche Dialektgeographie*, Heft xia, Marburg, 1922).

in place of a Franconian one in H (e.g., *daran: gran; tag: gesmack*). How can we explain the mixture of dialects in F (and the same thing is true of T1 and T2) except on the assumption that the scribe and the poet belonged to different districts? Surely the original dialect is that which F holds in common with the other texts, and the idiom of the scribe is found in those passages where F deviates from the other MSS. In other words the Alemannic portions are additions and the Middle German part is from the original.

Not only is H a better MS. than F; it is also older. The negative particle *en-*, which disappeared in the course of the fifteenth century, only occurs once in F, whereas in H there are eight cases and in T2 eleven. In the same way, F makes a much more sparing use of the prefix *ge-*. It is characteristic that in T1, which is a later MS. than H, F or T2, neither the negative prefix nor *ge-* in its special Middle High German functions is to be found at all.

Incidentally, we are in a position to date H approximately. The language is that of the middle of the fifteenth century. There is a close resemblance between the phonology of this text and that of the Mainz Kanzleisprache between 1410 and 1480. All the folios except 14 and 15 have water-marks. There are two types, which are both variations of the pattern designated by Briquet as 'raisin à grosse tige.' All the examples of this water-mark given by Briquet date from between 1420 and 1451¹. One, which very closely resembles one of the two in H, dates from 1445 and is from a MS. written at Eppelsheim in Hessen. The general conclusion is that the date of H is c. 1440. We already know that the dialect is Hessian².

The next point to consider is the interrelation of the various MSS. H is not the original; in some instances F, T2 or even T1, the worst of all the MSS., has a better reading than H. One example out of several will serve to show this:

Ich lesse und wieder lesse alle schrift,
und fynde nicht, das boser gyfft ist (H 97-98).

This couplet has no rhyme; compare

Ich sůch und lise in aller geschrift
und vinden nit, das da ist kein boser giff (F 446-447).
Liß und weder liß alle geschrift,
so vindes du kein boser vergiff (T1 97-98).

¹ *Les Filigranes*, iv, Nos. 12991, 12995, 13005, 13006, 13039 (Leipzig, 1923).

² Rieger, *loc. cit.*, p. 180. As regards the date of F, one would be inclined to say 'after 1450,' because in this year the reform of the Franciscan nunnery of Freiburg began and the transcription of the MS. would seem to be one of the fruits of this reform. See Bolte, *loc. cit.*, p. 132. The MS. itself bears the date 1467 in a contemporary hand.

Here, as often, T2 agrees with H:

Ich lese und weder lese alle schrift
und finde nit, das boser giff ist (T2 400-401).

In some passages T2 has more archaic forms than H. The former has the negative particle *en-* in two lines in which it is absent in H. *Welt* is invariably spelt as in modern German by the scribe of the Homburg MS., but in T2 there are eight examples of *werlt* and four of *werhelt*. But H is very near the original. The number of suspect passages is relatively small. If we make a tentative reconstruction of the original from the other existing MSS. the result is strikingly like H.

A comparison of H and T2 reveals the fact that the differences between them are largely confined to the spelling. The scribe of T2 contents himself with giving a Middle Franconian character to the words he transcribes, and rarely makes any alteration of importance. Unlike the scribe of F, he was not an innovator and not a poet. Obviously T2 is copied either from H or from the source of H.

In short, a critical edition of the *Spiegelbuch* can only be prepared in one way: H must be re-edited and better readings substituted wherever possible. The variants of the other fifteenth-century MSS. should be given. The Zimmern group (Z, Z2 and Z3) is too late to be of any value for the study of the text.

Dr Bolte tells us that he made his transcript of F in 1888. He does not seem to have collated it with the original, and in consequence his text is inaccurate or misleading in many details. Thus, in l. 334 he indicates that he has supplied *ich* (which was wanting in the MS.) by placing the word in square brackets, but in l. 179, where the MS. has 'solte ich der also,' he prints 'solte ich der welt also' without the use of brackets. Among the *Lesarten* on p. 171 he gives '734 nembt'; this is the reading of F, but in the printed text on p. 170 he gives *nembt* without alteration. Dr Bolte's emendations are open to criticism. In l. 43 he substitutes *armer* for *as mer* and prints:

so wölte ich armer frölich sterben.

But *as* is the correct form of *als* in Alemannic, as a glance at the *Schweizerisches Idiotikon* will show. To alter the word is quite unwarranted. H has

so wolt ich als mer frolich sterben

and T1

so moicht ich also mer frolich sterben.

It is not apparent why in l. 446 *kein böser giff* should be emended to *ein boser giff*, or why 'davon wer dise zergencklich zit anesechee' (l. 507)

should become 'darumb wer dise zergencklich zit anesechee.' *Anesechee* is subjunctive and is typically Alemannic. H has *ane sehe* and T1 *an siit*.

I add a list of errata: the first reading is that of the St Gall MS., the second that of Dr Bolte's text. 8 geniessen B genießen. 18 nach B noch. 28 nüt B nit. 34 andriswo B anderswo. 38 wore B ware. 47 ouch B auch (cf. 66 B ouch); kleiden B klaiden. 82 hertzlet B hertzleit. 94 also B als. 98 mûs MS. muß. 110 wenn B wann. 119 her? (i.e., herre, cf. 355) B herr. 125 uber B über. 134 gross B groß. 197 boum B baum. 257 urteiltist B urteiltest. 271 wolte B wölte. 272 genn B gen. 287 vatt? B vatters; 287 flusse B vlissee. 291 truwen B trüwen. 298 achtet B achten. 328 monsch (i.e., mönsch) B mensch. 339 uch B üch; furbas B fürbas. 340 furbas B fürbas. 356 grusenlich B grusenlich (cf. 482 B grusenlich). 357 nim B nimb. 367 sunden B sünden. 373 genn B gen. 385 er haben B erhaben. 392 ungestrafft B ungestraffet. 394 inn B in. 409 hilfft B hilfjet. 426 so B da. 434 nach B noch (cf. 443 B nach). 453 monschen B menschen. 461 denn B den. 496 zites B zite. 501 den B denn. 518 frumen B fromen. 521 herschaft B herschafft. 524 frunde B fründe. 538 warnd B warendt. 541 konend B könend. 548 gatt B gat. 559 iechlichs B iecklichs. 564 empfangen B empfangen. 569 und B under. 575 nit B mit. 613 denn B denen. 614 nû B nûn (cf. 619 B nû). 636 herzleid B hertzleid. 658 denn B den. 662 nund B nun. 668 latt B lat. 677 es B eh. 692 darüber B daruber. 720 ab nemm B abnem.

It might seem pedantic to mention all the cases where Dr Bolte simplifies a final consonant (*gat* for *gatt*, etc.), but this is characteristic of the Alemannic dialect. If in many instances Dr Bolte inserts the *Umlaut* sign, there are others where he leaves it out and one line (692) where he prints *u* for *ü* in the MS. The word *herte* does not appear in F in l. 371, being added in the margin. This and other corrections of the scribe are ignored.

Rieger defined the *Spiegelbuch* as 'Ein auf mehreren Dramen beruhendes, aus ihnen zusammengestelltes Erbauungsbuch.' Dr Bolte comes forward with a new hypothesis. Professor Stammer and others have endeavoured to prove that the *Dance of Death* did not originate in a drama, and it is not surprising to find that the same principle is applied to the *Spiegelbuch*. Dr Bolte expresses himself as follows: 'Aus diesen Gründen vermag ich im Spiegelbuch nicht ein Excerpt aus vier früheren Schauspielen zu erblicken, sondern ein Erbauungsbuch in dramatischer Form.' He considers that the origin is to be sought in 'bildliche Darstellungen.'

One is rather at a loss to know why the author or compiler of the *Spiegelbuch* should choose the form of reading plays for his didactic verse

rather than straightforward description or narrative. The work has all the essentials of true drama: contrast between the characters, dramatic conflict, action. The little drama of the unrepentant maiden and the Lazarus play even have a *mise-en-scène* of sorts. The locality of the latter changes from the rich man's house to the next world, the scenery is indicated by the illustrations. This play may be classified as a dramatic parable, like the *Spiel von den zehn Jungfrauen*, one version of which was performed at Eisenach in 1321.

The first part of F is a dialogue between a young man of the world and a man of religion. There is no exposition of any kind; the poet plunges at once *in medias res*. In a didactic poem all the necessary details would be added. The abrupt beginning suggests that we are reading a morality play which was actually performed, and from which most of the stage directions have been removed when an edifying book was made of it. There are rubrics in F which look like stage directions, e.g., *Responsio Christi, Est plenum*. Why should a Latin tag be inserted in a work which was merely intended to be read by pious laymen or nuns who presumably knew no Latin? They would be in their right place in a drama performed under the supervision of the clergy.

What are the rubrics in T1, unless they are stage directions? Let us take the first: 'We veer gesellen zo rait worden und meinten crer ein deil zo gein in einen geistlichen orden.' In a non-dramatic poem this would be narrated. In the interval between lines 625 and 626 (I am quoting from Rieger's edition) the youth joins a religious order, as we see from the rubric in T1: 'Nu hait der gesell einen grawen rock und einen geistlichen orden ain sich genomen' etc. Here again we see the essential difference between narrative verse and true drama. If the poem had been written to be read in the first instance, and not to be acted, the author would have mentioned the fact that his hero had taken the vows. In a drama this is unnecessary. The stage is left vacant for a short time to denote the passing of time and when the hero reappears he is wearing monastic garb, which sufficiently informs the audience as to what has happened in the interval.

J. M. CLARK.

GLASGOW.

REVIEWS

Die Vercelli-Homilien. Herausgegeben von MAX FÖRSTER. (*Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa*, XII. Band, 1. Hälfte.) Hamburg: Henri Grand. 1932. viii + 160 pp. 20 M.

The Vercelli Book. Edited by GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP. (*The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*, II.) New York: Columbia University Press; London: Geo. Routledge and Sons. 1932. xciv + 152 pp. 18s.

It is encouraging to find that, even amid the difficulties under which Germany is labouring at the present time, it has been possible to publish another part of the *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa*, and we can heartily endorse Professor Forster's own tribute in his preface to the courage and faith of his publisher. This volume when complete will give the text of the homilies in the *Vercelli Book*, the majority of which have never before been published¹. As was already known, several of these homilies are identical with, or closely related to, some of the homilies in the *Corpus Christi*, Cambridge, series (MSS. 41, 162, 198, 201, 303, 419), and the Bodley series (MSS. 340, 342, 343). In every case where the homily is found elsewhere Forster of course gives the variants. These sets of homilies must have been used by clergy and monks as source books for sermons, to be used not only for congregations consisting of less educated monks who were unable to understand Latin or of lay brethren, but also for mixed congregations of lay folk. Homily No. VII for instance is clearly intended for such a congregation (see p. 144, n. 37). The majority of the Old English homilies that have survived are simply translations, more or less literal, of Latin originals, as Forster has already shown². There is very little doubt that the homilies in this collection are translations too, though the originals have not yet been discovered. Doubtless they will turn up in due course. But a systematic study of the origin and use of the Old English homily and its possible influences, literary and otherwise, is long overdue.

These homilies provide, as one would expect, plenty of fresh material for the lexicographer. Most of the new forms or uses in the Vercelli homilies were collected by Napier³ and found their way into the *Supplement* to Bosworth-Toller. Some, however, have been missed: for example, *stingan* (p. 4, n. 11), used of putting the sword into the sheath—Bosworth-Toller actually quotes this instance, though the reference is wrongly given to a charter on the authority of Lye; *onsecgan* (p. 13) in its original sense of *witness, testify*; *unlædu* (p. 29, variant) *misery*; *genæglodon* (p. 30)—this form clearly shows that this verb belongs to the

¹ But see *Festschrift für L. Morsbach*, pp. 20–148, *Anglia*, v, pp. 454–65 and XLII, pp. 314–30, and E.E.T.S., CXXXVII, pp. 40–8. R. Willard in *Anglia*, LIV, p. 8 announced that he had a complete edition of the Vercelli homilies in hand.

² *Archiv für das Studium des Neueren Sprachen*, xci, pp. 179 ff.; ciii, pp. 149 ff.; cxvi, pp. 301 ff.; cxxii, pp. 246 ff.

³ *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 1906.

-ōjan class; *sýferlicness* (p. 59) *purity, sincerity*; *ofergemet* (p. 66) used as an adjective, so far only recorded as a substantive, *excessive*; *uncyst* (p. 75) *contempt*; *grim-hidig* (p. 77, variant) *fierce-minded*; *rūm-heortlice* (p. 83) *generously*; *ūtfeolan* (p. 95) *get out, break out*; *hāwung* (p. 99) *sight, ability to see*, not *observation* as in Bosworth-Toller—Förster points out (p. 99, n. 155) that the former meaning suits the two instances there quoted far better than the latter meaning, which is the only one there given; *staðol* (p. 99) in its original meaning of *ability to stand*; *forenemened* (p. 137) *before-mentioned*; *gebyrhtan* (p. 139) in the sense of *to make known*; *sunnanscīma* (p. 151) *sunshine*; *forscyred* (p. 152) *departed, dead*.

Other points which might be noted are: Homily II, p. 45 provides another good example of the list of the various fates of men, with which may be compared the lists in the *Wanderer*, 80 ff.; *Blick. Hom.* 95, 13 ff.; *Be Manna Wyrðum*, 10 ff.; *Be Manna Cræftum*, 53 ff. Homily V, p. 124, n. 99: surely the reading *gedafenlice þeogan* is better. The writer is obviously thinking of 1 Cor. xi, 25 ff., especially v. 29, 'Qui enim manducat et bibit indigne.' The words *lufian ond þonne clænlice* were apparently added later by a scribe who did not recognise the reference, and consequently did not follow the meaning. Homily V, n. 90 a: the point seems to be that the homilist is explaining the meaning of *fruma eallra gesceafta* (*primogenitus omnis creaturae*, Col. i, 15; note also *primogenitus ex mortuis*, i, 18). Though many others have risen from the dead (e.g., Lazarus and the many recorded in the various lives of the saints) yet they have all had to return to death again and they will have to rise again on the last day just like the rest of the dead. Homily III, n. 72: it is scarcely correct to say that *geearnian* has a dependent genitive here. The genitive surely follows *begitan* which is itself an infinitive dependent upon *geearnian*, probably a literal translation of Lat. *meruerunt* with dependent infinitive. P. 32, sixth line up, for *mīletes* read *mīlites*; p. 29, l. 24, for *Butrache* read *Blutrache*; p. 132, l. 33, for *cwonom* read *cwomon*.

Needless to say, this first section, like all Förster's work, is accurate and scholarly to the last degree. It is a pity that the volume has to be produced in sections which break off in the middle of a homily. Let us hope that the rest of the volume will speedily appear.

The *Vercelli Book* is a fresh edition by Professor Krapp of the poetical parts of the Vercelli MS. It is the second of the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* series which is to include all extant records of Old English poetry. It is a series which all students of Old English will welcome, though, as in the present case, little more can be done than go over ground which is already well trodden. For instance, even so careful a scholar as Professor Krapp has found nothing of importance to add to the full description of the MS. which Förster gave in the introduction to his splendid facsimile volume in which the whole book, both prose and poetry, appeared (*Il codice Vercellese*, Rome, 1913). The question is whether the advanced student, for whom these 'Records' are presumably intended, might not have been better served by an exact reproduction of the text. Emendations could then have been suggested in the foot-

notes. One scarcely sees the point of banishing accents, capitals, paragraphing and especially foliation, to prefatory tables. Certainly the list of accented words is useful, but it is important, as Keller shows¹, to see whereabouts in the line the accents occur. On the question of the use of the accent in Old English MSS. Krapp has no settled opinions. It is not quite correct to say that the accent is used in *Andreas* to distinguish *Ġod* from *gōd*. For in three instances at least it occurs with *gōd* too (ll. 897, 1281, 1462). Probably the scribe was copying the accents more or less mechanically from his exemplar. This would account for the fact that in the *Andreas*, *Fates of the Apostles* and *Elene*, the proportion of accented to unaccented syllables is about the same and considerably greater than in the other poems of the book. Possibly these three poems originally formed a single codex; at any rate they are the three poems of the collection which most distinctly form a group, being bound together by their definite Celtic connexions.

The notes are useful and scholarly, but it seems a pity not to have printed the Ruthwell Cross inscription and added references in the bibliography to some of the literature on the subject, such as Baldwin Brown's *Arts in Early England*, v.

But if Professor Krapp has little fresh to tell us about these poems, it is simply because they have already found a series of competent editors, including Professor Krapp himself. In pursuance of the plan of his collective edition, the work had to be done over again and he has done it competently.

B. COLGRAVE.

DURHAM.

Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses. Stage Plots: Actors' Parts: Prompt Books. By W. W. GREG. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1931. Vol. I, Commentary: xiii + 378 pp. Vol. II, Reproductions and Transcripts: 20 collotype plates and letter-press. 84s.

In these learned and sumptuous volumes Dr Greg brings to order the results of investigations, which began with his *Henslowe's Diary* and *Henslowe Papers* of 1904-8, and have continued through long years of patient editorship for the *Malone Society Reprints*. A trained skill in the marshalling of complicated evidence and an exceptional *flair* for minute palæographical detail have combined to produce a work, which will long remain of fundamental value to students, alike of theatrical history and of textual criticism in its application to the drama of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A folio of admirable collotype facsimiles serves as the foundation for a quarto of disquisitions. Here are the six extant 'plots' or tiring-house outlines of plays, each faced with a transcript in which variations of type and bracket-form indicate the different scripts of the originals, their deletions and mutilations, and the conjectural readings which are at some points necessary. A second

¹ W. Keller, *Über die Akzente in den angelsächsischen Handschriften in Untersuchungen und Quellen*, Prague, 1908.

transcript for *The Battle of Alcazar*, several fragments of which have at some time been mounted out of order by a repairer, represents a rearrangement by Dr Greg, and is an excellent illustration of his minute vision for significant detail. The plots are followed by facsimiles and transcripts of the 'part' of Orlando, as played by the actor Edward Alleyn in Greene's *Orlando Furioso*, and these again by specimen pages, similarly treated, from the manuscripts of nine plays, ranging in date over nearly half a century, all of which show signs of having been prepared for actual use in the theatre, and having undergone some adaptation to meet the requirements of censors and prompters.

The volume of 'Commentary' amounts to much more than that description implies. It is in part devoted to a technical discussion of textual points arising on the facsimiles, and of the inferences which can be drawn from the plots, in particular, as to the subject-matter and casting of the plays to which they relate, most of which are not otherwise preserved. But it adds fresh reproductions of its own, notably from four mediæval examples of actors' 'parts.' And it expands into a full and luminous survey of the whole nature of theatrical 'documents,' of their interrelations, and of the methods of Elizabethan and Stuart stage managers in handling the scripts furnished by the dramatists. And, as Dr Greg himself points out,

In so far as the printed texts of the Elizabethan drama—using that term in an extended sense—ultimately hale from the playhouses—and to this conclusion recent criticism seems generally tending—it is documents such as these that lie behind the early editions, and it is in terms of these that the latter must be criticized and judged.

Upon 'parts' Dr Greg has not a great deal to add to, or to qualify in, the earlier treatment of his *Alcazar and Orlando* (1923). His main discussion, therefore, falls naturally into two sections, one of which is concerned primarily with plots, and the other with 'prompt books,' if that rather precise term, not itself of very old standing, may be taken to cover theatrical texts in various stages of completeness. A summary of the 'General Characteristics' of each type of document is supported by elaborate studies of the individual examples. In dealing with plots, Dr Greg is, of course, re-traversing ground already trodden in his work on Henslowe, and here further research has now enabled him to arrive at something approaching as near to finality as the comparatively scanty material permits. We have, indeed, only half-a-dozen plots, from two or three hands, out of the vast number which successive book-keepers must have compiled, and this inevitably gives an air of speculation to Dr Greg's attempt to reconstruct 'the genesis and development of the type.' He is himself quite conscious of the fact; and the attempt and the admission are doubly characteristic of his qualities; of the pertinacity which will not neglect to follow up the slightest trace of evidence, and of the integrity which constantly refuses to rate evidence at more than it is logically worth. Finality is again the note of Dr Greg's excursus upon the history of the companies to whom the plots belonged, and of the actors, often obscure, who are named in them. There can be little more to be said about

these, unless and until the overhauling of lawsuits and parish registers brings new information to light. That is, no doubt, likely to happen from time to time. Even since this book was published, indeed, its statement that Richard Burbage 'cannot have been much over, and was probably not much under, twenty' in 1590-1 has been brought in question by Mr J. H. Morrison's discovery that James Burbage had a son Richard baptised at the church of St Stephen Coleman on May 28, 1562, and a son Utbart, probably the same as Cuthbert, on June 15, 1565. Against this, however, must be put a deposition which describes Richard, during Cuthbert's lifetime, as the youngest son of James, and a statement by Cuthbert himself that Richard at his death in 1619 had been concerned with the stage for thirty-five years, which would not take the beginning of his career farther back than 1584. Being the son of an actor he is likely to have acted from an early age. The most plausible explanation of the discrepancy is that James Burbage lost a son Richard in childhood, and transferred the name to another.

Dr Greg's survey of prompt books carries him far beyond the nine manuscripts from which he gives facsimiles. For the first time we get something like a complete and authoritative list of all manuscripts related to plays of the public stage up to the closing of the theatres. This is in itself a considerable achievement. In all, sixty-one plays are concerned, for several of which there is more than one manuscript. A few are university or closet plays or mere 'entertainments,' such as are normally left out of account. A few others are more or less briefly recorded. Thirty, of which a good many have been reprinted for the Malone Society, are divided by Dr Greg into two classes. Fifteen show definite signs of theatrical adaptation for actual performance, and may be regarded generically as prompt books. The other fifteen, although they may have originated in the playhouse, show no such signs, are often in calligraphic scripts, and may be copies made for private collectors. Manuscripts of either type may underlie printed texts, and one of the first duties of an editor is to study the probabilities in any particular case. He will learn much from Dr Greg's acute analysis of the methods of theatrical book-keepers in the preparation of prompt books, and from the detailed descriptions of the thirty manuscripts, to each of which is appended a table of stage directions, in which the incidence of the adapter's hand is carefully noted. It need hardly be said that in this part of his work Dr Greg regards himself as a pioneer, and makes no claim to finality. He is providing material for an investigation which, as he rightly says, is among the most pressing tasks which await students of the Elizabethan drama:

Not only do we need a study of the texts of these plays, the peculiarities of which will undoubtedly throw light on possible sources of corruption, but perhaps even more of the practice of act and scene division and indication, and of the stage directions, both those of the original text and those added in the course of preparation for performance. Only when we are fully and certainly informed in these respects shall we be able to say with any confidence what features of a printed edition point towards, and what away from, the use of a playhouse manuscript as copy, and replace by

sound knowledge the subjective and sometimes fantastic criteria which critics have applied in the past.

It is sound counsel, and certainly the prompt books, after all that Dr Greg has been able to do for their elucidation, still present some rather puzzling problems for solution. One of these is connected with the working of the censorship. It is clear, on the one hand, that the Master of the Revels sometimes gave his allowance subject to 'reformatations' which he had himself indicated on a manuscript, and, on the other, that many of the 'reformatations,' which the manuscripts show, are not due to the Master himself, but to the author or the book-keeper, anticipating his criticisms. 'In many things you have saved mee labour; yet when your judgment or penn fayld you, I have made boulde to use mine,' writes Herbert to the book-keeper Knight. But what was the status of manuscripts, such as that of *Sir John van Olden Barnavelte*, on which the Master has indicated 'reformatations' or the need for them, but has, to all appearance, given no allowance 'at the latter end of the said booke they doe play,' such as a company license by Tilney required in 1583? Are we to assume that it was given on a separate sheet now lost, or even orally, which would not be very safe for the players? Or was further submission to the Master necessary, and if so was the *Barnavelte* MS., which we have, recopied, since the play was undoubtedly acted? Why, again, are the book-keeper's glossings of stage directions with the names of actors so sporadic—not merely limited, intelligibly enough, to supernumeraries, but to some of these, and to some of their appearances in a play? Dr Greg makes it clear, at any rate, that every such gloss in the manuscripts 'is written in a different hand from the text, or at any rate in a different ink or style, showing it to be a later addition and not part of the original composition'; and this certainly tends to discredit the theory of Professor Gaw, recently revived by Dr McKerrow, that analogous glosses in Shakespearean texts may be due to the author and not to the book-keeper. But I must not consider here the question whether Shakespeare's plays were set up from prompt copies or 'foul papers,' if indeed any 'foul papers' are likely to have existed in his case. That is, indeed, just one of the problems which Dr Greg's masterly handling of the manuscripts may some day help to solve.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

EYNSHAM.

A History of Shakespearian Criticism. By AUGUSTUS RALLI. 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press. x + 566 and 582 pp. 42s.

So with this robe they cloath him, bid him weare it
For time shall never staine, nor envy teare it.

The first impression aroused by this amazing book was one of disappointment. Here, it seemed, was a Shakespeare Allusion-Book without the allusions; for the authentic voice of Hansard, a *Times* report. But disappointment changed to admiration on further acquaintance. Mr Ralli has taken the whole body of Shakespearean criticism for his province, from Francis Meres and the first century of incidental criticism and

allusion to the purposive criticism of the succeeding centuries, closing in 1925. Encyclopædic in range, his book presents a line of masterly summaries of all the great French, German and English criticism and Mr Ralli seems to have surveyed every notable lecture or random article bearing upon Shakespeare.

His method is simple and thorough; he groups his writers chronologically and nationally, summarises the work of each, in turn, and then concludes each section with a formal *résumé* of the characteristics of the writers within it. The summaries are skilfully and impartially written, but many readers will, perhaps, find fault with his spacing. One chapter, of eleven pages, is devoted to the incidental allusion and tentative criticism of the first hundred years—the period covered by *The Shakespeare Allusion-Book*. The rest of the first volume carries us through the uneasy enthusiasm of the early eighteenth century to the mid-century when critics held Shakespeare 'to be either unique, or at least equal to the ancients, as dramatist, poet, philosopher, portrayer of character' and 'The public, whose instinct was equal to that of the best critics, flocked to see his plays acted and called for edition after edition of his works,' then on through the next hundred years of indiscriminating praise and complete acceptance, to the year 1875. The second volume covers just fifty years, the period of historical criticism, when the study of social background, politics, stage conditions, palæography, language, textual criticism and æsthetic penetration unite to produce the finest collective criticism that Shakespeare has provoked.

Some readers will question the space that Mr Ralli has given to individual critics; others will dissent from his valuations. He does less than justice, or so it appears, to the eighteenth-century editors, as also to Goethe and Schucking, to Fleay and Stoll; Morgann, Dowden and Robertson, on the other hand, are treated with fine penetration. We rejoice that Raleigh's book, the best work of small compass ever written upon Shakespeare, is worthily praised. He has placed many students in his debt for the summaries of writers whose works are remote or wholly inaccessible, as in his account of Peter Whalley 'who makes it rather clearer than his forerunners that the "nature" for which Shakespeare has been praised is human nature and men's passions,' the first writer to illustrate Shakespeare's art, the first to reveal 'the beauty which Shakespeare gives to the thing described.'

Where so much has been given we hesitate to cavil at omissions, but we are jealous for certain names. The author's plan was 'to follow the course of æsthetic opinion on Shakespeare,' and this, perhaps, explains the lack of reference to Abbott's *Grammar*, Simpson's *Punctuation*, and the earlier writings (to 1925) of the More controversy. But one would expect some mention of Herford's *Sketch of Recent Shakespearean Investigation* (1923). Tucker-Brooke, Greg and Pollard are not concerned solely with bibliography, but they do not come in. That he should omit from the incidental criticism all mention of Willobie, *The Return from Parnassus*, of Milton and many others, may turn upon some criterion of his own, but surely the omission of Keats was an oversight? The Letters

are loaded with ore, and a single remark, 'Shakespeare's indolent and kingly gaze,' envisages a whole volume of criticism. It may be objected that imaginative treatment of this kind is alien to Mr Ralli's method, and this, perhaps, is true, for his attitude is sternly objective. His attitude may, indeed, account for what is the main fault of the book—we are tempted to say the only fault—which is one of structure.

Mr Ralli has collected with prodigious learning and industry a host of facts which are massed but not marshalled; he pipes but they will not dance. A summary of big criticism, his book is not, in its existing shape, a big critical work. For the range and skill of his masterly summaries we are grateful; but we miss a philosophic background. What we get is a vast note-book of Shakespearean criticism. What we would desire is the story of Shakespearean criticism. Could he not give us a summary of summaries, an appendix of some length, with a coherent account of the progress of Shakespearean criticism? That seems all that is needed to make the work in its own kind a triumphant success. As it stands, it is a magnificent torso.

In his preface the author declares that his aim was to make these massed opinions 'yield an æsthetic moral.' But the Shakespearean æsthetic does not emerge. His aim, again, was to make 'a kind of epitome of the movements of the human mind through three most eventful centuries.' He has failed to give us this epitome, although there are rare glimpses of the goal. Thus,

The final impression from the collected German critics (between 1767 and 1813) differs from the English and French. It is less literary and more philosophic; it hints at a science of human nature. It uses art and characterization as the servants of abstract knowledge (I, p. 125).

Or, again, when summarising Professor Sisson's first important work:

Those who direct the popular soul can create nothing, for the more their soul approaches the people's, the more widespread are their ideas; and the more the universal spirit accords with that of the highest, the greater and more beautiful does literature become. . . . Our final emotion is that all things contributed to Shakespeare and Shakespeare perfected all things; that in the great ages of the world realism and romanticism are one; and if they are disparted. . . . these ages fail morally and socially. . . . Dr Sisson proves to us historically, psychologically and æsthetically that Shakespeare's greatness was founded in the deep places of the human nature of one of the world's elect ages (II, pp. 478–86).

What Mr Ralli could give us is plain if we look at other representative passages. He finds in Sir Walter Raleigh's work something of that excessive vitality which Bradley makes the grand characteristic of Shakespeare's heroes and writes:

Walter Raleigh has said some of the greatest things about Shakespeare. He is less critical and philosophic and psychological than Professor Bradley, but his book ultimately conveys a special kind of mystery and vastness in Shakespeare that no other writer has yet shown us. . . . What first strikes us is his robust temperament and large vitality. He is impatient of unnecessary details and we shall see later the part this plays in determining his manner of approaching the great problems.

Speaking of 'Q,' he says,

Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch is greater in his likes than his dislikes. . . . He defends Imogen in language that Swinburne would have approved; in art it is the result that

counts, not the process. But the faults he finds, as with the Merchant, are more with the letter than the spirit of the play, or are overstated, as with the moral of Falstaff. On the other hand, they witness to a mind not overwhelmed by the study of Shakespeare; essentially a modern mind, which the Victorians would have called irreverent, but we prefer to call anti-hypocritical. He shows us that the world is changing, that new ideas are evolving, and not everything in Shakespeare is time-proof.

Then, of Benedetto Croce:

The outer robe of Professor Croce's interpretation does not differ notably from that of other critics. It is no novel teaching that one must discard history and biography and judge the poet only by his poetry. However this is but the approach to Professor Croce's central idea—the pangs that precede the birth of the work of art . . . And when he says in the end that a greater conception of reality is born out of the agony, we feel that he has taken us within earshot of the throbbing sound of the creative impulse. Beauty born out of sorrow, hope out of earthly wrack, is the artist's goal.

(How could Mr Ralli have forgotten Keats when he wrote this?) Not all of Mr Ralli's pages are so happily worded. In general his style is buoyant and fresh, lucid, sternly objective and judicial. If at times his writing becomes strained, bald or loose, it is doubtless occasioned in part by the deadly exercise of summarising. (There are nearly twelve hundred pages of it.) His meaning is rarely obscure, but sentences like the following are not infrequent: 'Truly Shakespearian is Macbeth's character reflected in Banquo's unpossessed mind, like a clear mirror.'

In sum, the book remains a mine for students. Those to whom the literature and spirit of criticism are important will be disappointed, but they too may profit if they pass from the book to the originals and back again. As a work of reference, it will be surprising if it does not find a place in all libraries side by side with Chambers and the *New Allusion-Book*, to check and inspire research. The essential Shakespeare is yet to seek. He has flung his challenging lines down three centuries and still eludes our question.

BARRY GARRAD.

LONDON.

The Restoration Court Stage. By ELEANORE BOSWELL. Cambridge, Mass.. Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1932. xii + 370 pp. 25s.

The story of the Restoration Court theatre is better calculated to form a meagre chapter in the sociological history of its period than a chapter in the history of English drama. Though Charles II and a select band of his courtiers exercised a potent influence on the characteristics and colour of Restoration dramaturgy, the Court theatre was in nowise associated with the directive force. Creatively, it did not count. It was ill-organised—if, indeed, it can be said to have been organised at all; and it was parasitic. These facts are not new, but, thanks to Miss Eleanore Boswell's purposeful researches in the Public Record Office, they have now been brought into much better focus. It would give a wholly erroneous impression to fall back on the well-worn phrase and say that this acute young American scholar had made the most of her material, seeing that the really vital data in her book have not so much been found as recreated.

From the hitherto unbroached Accounts of the King's Office of Works she has educed an abundance of cryptic detail concerning the furnishing of the Court theatre, such as would be Greek to any searcher ill-versed either in Inigo Jones's later system of masque staging or in the general methods of play presentation in the latter half of the seventeenth century. Armed with the necessary basic knowledge, she has brought light out of darkness by adroitly piecing together many scattered items of correlative but obscure evidence. Though the task was severe, few of the problems which cropped up in its course but have met with their solution. Little by little, a revealing picture has been stippled in of the wholly individual and largely inadequate conditions which obtained in that ill-designed asylum for the dramatic muses constructed by Webb in the Great Hall in 1665. The prime misfortune was that it was never entirely devoted to their worship. Used alternately for plays and for balls, it was lacking in stability. There could be no permanency of structure when the floor of the pit had so frequently to be brought up to stage level for purposes of dancing. Indifferently equipped behind the curtain, inferior in appointments to the public theatres of its time (which the King much preferred visiting), the house was acoustically defective. It is hardly believable that in the beginning its stage had no cellar, yet eight years passed before it was provided with a single trap. With the richer spectacular necessities it could not cope: for them flies were demanded, and no response came to that demand until 1684.

Naturally, there are a good many points in Miss Boswell's book which call for vigorous discussion. Basing her argument on Webb's designs for the Hall Theatre made in 1665, she maintains that 'the scenery of the Restoration Court Theatre closely followed the masque type of staging made familiar by the Inigo Jones plans for the stage of *Salmacida Spolia*, and Webb's for the *Siege of Rhodes*.' To this one must demur. The statement is too sweeping. The old masque method of staging was not at all adapted for the staging of Restoration plays once the usage of scenery in the theatres had created a new technique. Whereas in masque staging all the flats were placed well behind the last pair of wings, in the acting of the Restoration drama the flats had to be widely distributed, and were run on on occasion behind any pair of wings. Characters had sometimes to be closed in at the end of a scene or discovered by the drawing of a scene. This was the beginning of a system which lasted well up to within living memory.

In discussing the systematic placing of green baize on the Restoration Court stage, Miss Boswell speculates as to whether this was a carrying-over of old custom, and points out that Reyher indicates the provision of green cloth for the Jacobean masques. That is so, but the records of the earlier provision in nowise apply to the stage, since they deal solely with the carpeting of the separate dancing place on the floor of the hall.

In reproducing the terms of the abortive patent granted by the King to Giulio Gentileschi in 1660 for the establishment of an Italian Opera House, Miss Boswell assumes that they have not previously been published. Priority in these matters is a thing of little consequence, and, if

I take leave to point out now that the patent was given *in extenso* in my article on 'Italian Opera in London' published in *The Musical Antiquary* of April, 1911, it is because I then advanced reasons why the grant proved nugatory and gave some particulars concerning the Gentileschi family to explain how it came to be made.

Of the several interesting tables in the book, perhaps the most useful is the Calendar of plays acted at Court from 1660 to 1700. This admits of some additions. The exact date of the listed performance of *The Stepmother* at the Cockpit was December 10, 1663. A letter of the King to his sister, reproduced in Julia Cartwright's *Madame*, indicates the performance at Court of a new play on July 14, 1664, possibly *Pompey the Great*. Miss Boswell has done scholarship a prime service in demonstrating that Evelyn's dates for theatrical events are not dependable, but, in dealing with the crux presented by the Court performance of *Horace* by distinguished amateurs, does she not err in stating that February 4, 1667-8, was Ash Wednesday, and therefore an unlikely date for the performance? My perpetual calendar gives it as a Tuesday. This point apart, I am inclined to believe that the actual date of the performance was February 4, 1668-9, or a fortnight after the play's production at the Theatre Royal, Bridges Street. My notes also tell me that the unidentified play given at Court on February 6, 1696-7, was *Love for Love*.

Adequate discussion of the characteristics and activities of the Court stage in the first lustrum of Charles II's reign, when acting was confined to the royal Cockpit hard by Holbein Gate, has very fortunately necessitated some harking back on Miss Boswell's part to the tantalising records of Caroline days. One says very fortunately because in this way a baffling problem, over which scholars have worried for years, has been advanced a step towards its solution. In the first place, it is vital to recall that not until 1633 was the Court able to boast possession of a permanent playhouse. Of the locality of the first Whitehall theatre one cannot be certain owing to the inadequacy of the evidence, but it in nowise runs counter to the accepted opinion that, so far from being an entirely new structure, the theatre was constructed within the reshaped walls of the old Cockpit. Webb's Palladian design (which has been reproduced and discussed in Professor Quincy Adams's *Shakesperean Playhouses*, chapter xx) was certainly made for this building, but we do not know when or whether it was ever acted upon. Miss Boswell has satisfactorily narrowed the issue by confuting Mr W. G. Keith's argument that it was first utilised at the Restoration. It needs also to say, notwithstanding Mr Keith's contentions to the contrary, that Webb's Palladian proscenium was in nowise adapted for use with scenery. There are no indications on Webb's accompanying ground-plan of the plantation of scenery, such as we invariably get in Inigo Jones's ground-plans, not only for masque scenery but for pastorals and other plays. Evidence is lacking to show whether or not this Palladian screen was readily removable, but, if it were not and were established in 1633, it certainly must have been taken away for good within a lustrum. The proof lies in Inigo Jones's design for *The Queen of Arragon* (originally known as *Cleodora*), which the interested reader will

find reproduced in Professor Allardyce Nicoll's *British Drama*, where, by an unfortunate slip, it is assigned to the Drury Lane Cockpit. Departing for once from her normal wariness, Miss Boswell has allowed herself to be led astray by the red herring which Mr W. G. Keith drew across the trail in discussing this design, but there is absolutely no room for doubt about the particular play for which it was made. Since it is inscribed, 'for ye Cockpit for my lo. Chaberlin, 1639,' it must have been intended for *The Queen of Arragon*, the only play of that period given at Court at the Lord Chamberlain's expense. The fact, duly recorded by Sir Henry Herbert, that Habington's new tragedy was performed twice at this time in the Great Hall, and not at all in the Cockpit, affords no reason for disputing the identification. Whatever the reason for the change of place—probably the need of a larger stage—the design was certainly made for the Whitehall Cockpit and the inscription indicates the original intention. It would be idle to say that scenery of the type therein portrayed could be reconciled with Webb's Palladian screen, but, in order to set the matter at rest, it is advisable to advance further evidence. We know from Sir Henry Herbert's Revels Accounts that Carlell's *The Passionate Lovers*, Part II (Part I having previously been produced at Somerset House) was acted at the royal Cockpit on December 20 and 27, 1638. That the sequel then had scenery calling for an unobstructed stage is shown by the fact that two of the designs for its mounting have come down to us, both of an elaborate order. (They form Nos. 380 and 382 in the Malone Society's catalogue of the Inigo Jones designs.) On this score, I think it is unfortunate that Miss Boswell, who will be taken in days to come as speaking with authority, and not as the scribes, should have expressed her belief that Webb's Palladian screen was still *in situ* at the Cockpit when the King came to his own again, and so remained. Against that supposition comes the item of November, 1660 (p. 239), 'Taking up ye floor of ye stage and pitt and laying againe the floore of the stage and pitt pendant.' Moreover, the provision of a curtain rod 8 ft. long (p. 16) savours somewhat of the old Elizabethan traverses. It would appear that in the royal Cockpit acting was resumed in exactly the same way as it was in the first Restoration theatres (even in the first new built theatre of the time), to wit, on obsolescent platform-stage principles.

May I take advantage of this opportunity to protest against the growing tendency among the academic presses of the United States to illustrate books of historical investigation in whole or part with fancy sketches? In the present case, the Harvard University Press is not wholly to blame since Miss Boswell accepts full responsibility. I wonder does she really believe that Mr E. C. Northover's conjectural view of the proscenium and stage of the Hall Theatre gives anything like a correct impression of the scenic methods of the time? She must surely be aware (none better) regarding the old sky-borders that the farther they went back the farther they came down. Mr Northover makes a pretty picture at the expense of truth.

W. J. LAWRENCE.

LONDON.

Paradise Regained, by JOHN MILTON. Edited with Introduction and Commentary by E. H. BLAKENEY. London: Scholartis Press. 1932. ix + 187 pp. 12s. 6d.

This is a finely produced book, pleasant to look at and to handle. Except for the elaborate and incongruous head-pieces to the books of the poem, the print is plain and dignified and in keeping with the verse; indeed one thinks regretfully of the pleasure of reading Milton's text so printed. But why go to this trouble and expense of workmanship for a nineteenth-century text of the poem that is already available in many and adequate forms? Mr Blakeney says that 'the text is, obviously, founded on the *editio princeps* of 1671; but the spelling has been modernized and the punctuation revised. We do not print the Authorized Version of the Bible in the 1611 spelling; and I can see no good reason for reproducing Milton's text *exactly* as it appeared originally, in matters of orthography, except in one or two cases.' One hesitates to say whether this is ingenuous or disingenuous; it is certainly misleading. Mr Blakeney's text, by his own showing, can be said to be founded on the *editio princeps* only in the sense that all other editions of *Paradise Regained* are: the first printing was in fact so well done that all subsequent editions are reprints except in spelling and punctuation. Consequently editions are distinguished by their punctuation. Judged by this criterion, Mr Blakeney's text is, obviously, founded on Masson's edition of 1890, he reproduces substantially Masson's punctuation, his revision consisting chiefly in additional dashes. The justification for estimating an edition on this basis and for treating these apparently trivial textual matters as important will appear more plainly in the sequel.

Mr Blakeney directs chief attention to the less important question of the spelling. Perhaps no great harm, though no conspicuous benefit, comes of modernising the spelling. But certainly the question is not settled by the false analogy of the Authorised Version of the Bible, which ignores the real point that *Paradise Regained* is verse and that Milton's spelling and punctuation were admittedly designed as guides to how he wished his verses read. Mr Blakeney moreover puts himself in a dilemma when he decides to retain Milton's spelling 'in one or two cases.' He hereby admits that Milton's spelling may be of consequence: is he sure that he has spotted all the cases? But he goes further, and fairly bewilders us, when he alters the original spelling *Sov'raign* (I, 84) to *sovrán*, observing that this is Milton's spelling elsewhere: 'as Milton could not correct his proofs, the French form of the word must have crept in by error.' But the word only occurs this once after *Paradise Lost*: how does Mr Blakeney know that Milton had not changed his spelling? Is he sure Milton did not here intend a long syllable? And anyhow, what particular merit is there in this Miltonic spelling that he should go out of his way to introduce it into his modernised text? The long and the short of it is that there is no good reason for not reproducing Milton's spelling; it is never ugly or illegible, and has the positive merit of being phonetic. To reprint would be so much simpler and safer for editors. Why this struggling into pitfalls? as a lady of my acquaintance once remarked.

But it is the question of punctuation that is more important. The assumptions underlying the repunctuation of Milton's poems, particularly of *Paradise Regained*, as will be seen from two quotations from nineteenth-century editors to be given in a moment, are first that Milton was indifferent to this mechanical matter, secondly that he was blind and his printer inefficient, and thirdly that any up-to-date punctuation is absolutely better than that of former times. In accordance with these assumptions the punctuation of Milton's poems was progressively modernised throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to suit the prevailing mode. During those centuries the method of punctuating moved steadily away from what is called a *rhetorical* towards what is called a *logical* system; that is to say, punctuation came more and more to be used to indicate the grammatical structure rather than the rhythm and modulation of the sentence. Milton's poems were made to advance with the times, each generation of editors revising the punctuation under the impression that they were perfecting the text; until perfection or at least a *ne plus ultra* was reached in the second half of the nineteenth century. By that time a system of punctuation had been devised which exhibited the grammatical structure of the sentence in every bone and joint; it is the system still favoured by printers' readers, and may have been chiefly due to them. Milton's poetry was first subjected to this Victorian punctuation in Knightley's edition of 1859: 'To the punctuation,' he says, 'I have devoted the closest attention. On this point Milton himself was perfectly heedless... Being no idolater of the old printers, I have submitted to no authority or guidance but those of Grammar and Logic... I have thus, I believe, brought the punctuation of these poems to a high degree of perfection such as it had never attained. . In this correctness I am mainly indebted to the valuable aid of my friend Mr J. E. Taylor [his printer], and of a most excellent Reader in his office¹.' Masson similarly argues that Milton was indifferent to punctuation and left that part of the business to his printers, who served him badly in *Paradise Regained*: 'There was very good punctuation in Milton's time, though not on that strict logical principle which ought now to be accepted as the only proper one for systematic pointing, but rather on a combination of that principle with regard for the vocal pauses convenient in reading... Milton's neglect of points in his MSS., therefore, was not the mere custom of his time; it was the voluntary carelessness in this matter of a man peculiarly accurate and punctilious in his syntax and rhythms. Of course, he intended that, when his drafts were published, the pointing should be set right by the printer, or by the printer and himself together².' Masson accordingly perfects the work of printer's reader begun by Knightley and does what he can to make Milton's verse read like Tennyson's or Browning's.

But why should Mr Blakeney reproduce Masson's antiquated punctuation? If he wished to carry on this editorial tradition he should have attended to present-day usage. *Logical* punctuation having reached its logical conclusion, contemporary writers have revolted against it as

¹ *Op. cit.*, I, pp. ix-x.

² *Milton's Poetical Works* (1890), II, p. 104.

against other Victorian modes. They are reverting both in prose and verse to a more *rhetorical* pointing; they punctuate for rhythm and emphasis, using as little purely grammatical pointing as possible. And this in principle is Milton's method. Not that any writer nowadays would punctuate exactly as Milton did, any more than he would construct a Miltonic period; but he would find much less to alter in Milton's punctuation than Knightley or Masson did. The objection then to Mr Blakeney's text is that it is neither Milton's nor modern.

The truth is that, apart from a few probable errors to be dealt with in the ordinary course of textual criticism, there is no reason for altering the original punctuation of *Paradise Regained* and good reason for not doing so. The assumption that Milton, 'a man peculiarly accurate and punctilious in his syntax and rhythms,' was heedless of punctuation is unlikely on the face of it and sufficiently contradicted by the fact that his verse as he printed it reads both easily and effectively; the reasonable assumption is that he wrote with that system of punctuation in mind, however much one supposes the printer to have had to do with the actual pointing. Comparison of the Masson-Blakeney text with the original shows that to tamper with the punctuation is constantly to spoil intended effects in style, in flow or turn of expression, in rhythm, modulation and emphasis, and it at once leaps to the eye that our modern texts are sufficient cause for thinking the style of this poem prosaic; the comparison also reveals how well the original punctuation was adapted to Milton's syntax, and that it cannot be altered without altering the construction and not infrequently the sense. Indeed it appears that those who repunctuate Milton's verse should not stop short of rewriting it. The only way to realise the full extent of the vandalism is to read through the present version side by side with that of 1671; but I shall give a few examples to illustrate the results, quoting the 1671 version first in each case. First some examples of wanton alteration of rhythm:

| | |
|---|---------|
| Now had the great Proclaimer with a voice More awful than the sound of Trumpet, cri'd Repentance. | (I, 18) |
| Now had the great Proclaimer, with a voice More awful than the sound of trumpet, cried Repentance | |

Milton's single comma marks a characteristic climax, the introduction of the second comma, making a parenthesis, breaks the march of the words up to that climax and reduces the lines to a prosaic level.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| And now too soon for us the circling hours This dreaded time have compast. | (I, 57-8) |
| And now, too soon for us, the circling hours This dreaded time have compast. | |

Again the parenthesis interrupts the grave and measured rhythm, with the effect of a prose paraphrase.

| | |
|--|-------------|
| So saying he caught him up, and without wing Of <i>Hippogrif</i> bore through the air sublime Over the wilderness and o're the plain; Till underneath them fair <i>Jerusalem</i> , The holy City lifted high her Towers. | (IV, 541-5) |
|--|-------------|

So saying, he caught him up, and, without wing
Of hippogrif, bore through the air sublime,
Over the wilderness and o'er the plain...

This marvellous irresistible flight has become the protesting tale of an old wife who thinks you don't believe her.

Be frustrate all ye stratagems of Hell,
And devilish machinations come to nought. (I, 180-1)
Be frustrate, all ye stratagems of Hell,
And, devilish machinations, come to nought!

Any schoolboy reading the lines so would deserve whipping.

But thou art plac't above me, thou art Lord;
From thee I can and must submiss endure
Check or reproof, and glad to scape so quit. (I, 475-7)
But thou art placed above me; thou art Lord;
From thee I can, and must, submiss, endure
Check or reproof, and glad to scape so quit.

Does anyone really prefer the printer's reader to Milton?

'And now by some strong motion I am led
Into this wilderness, to what intent
I learn not yet, perhaps I need not know;
For what concerns my knowledge God reveals.'
So spake our Morning Star then in his rise,
And looking round on every side beheld
A pathless desert, dusk with horrid shades. (I, 290-6)
'And now by some strong motion I am led
Into this wilderness; to what intent
I learn not yet. Perhaps I need not know;
For what concerns my knowledge God reveals.'
So spake our Morning Star, then in his rise,
And, looking round, on every side beheld
A pathless desert, dusk with horrid shades.

Small wonder the verse of *Paradise Regained* is considered dangerously near to prose.

These examples show how *logical* punctuation changes pause and stress, tending to throw emphasis on words like *and* and *then*; but I shall give some particular examples of the altering of emphasis. Milton often uses a comma to italicise a word:

On the other side know also thou, that I
On what I offer set as high esteem. (IV, 159-60)
On the other side know also thou that I
On what I offer set as high esteem.

Removing the comma only ensures the misreading of the line. This use of the comma to throw special emphasis on a word is all the more obvious at the end of a line, where Milton ordinarily omits commas as unnecessary:

His Mother then is mortal, but his Sire,
He who obtains the Monarchy of Heav'n. (I, 86-7)
His mother, then, is mortal, but his Sire
He who obtains the monarchy of Heaven.

An editor gratuitously removing the comma should italicise *Sire*.
Contrast:

E're in the head of Nations he appear
Their King, their Leader, and Supream on Earth. (I, 98-9)
Ere in the head of nations he appear,
Their king, their leader, and supreme on Earth.

Milton's line runs on to throw full emphasis on *King* and the successive titles. Again:

Regents and Potentates, and Kings, yea gods
Of many a pleasant Realm and Province wide. (I, 117-8)
Regents, and potentates, and kings, yea gods,
Of many a pleasant realm and province wide.

To alter the poet's careful placing of pause and stress in this manner is to stultify all praise of his metrical skill.

I shall give one example of the way repunctuation entails interfering with Miltonic syntax:

Princes, Heavens antient Sons, Aethereal Thrones,
Demonian Spirits now, from the Element
Each of his reign allotted, rightlier call'd,
Powers of Fire, Air, Water, and Earth beneath,
So may we hold our place and these mild seats
Without new trouble; such an Enemy
Is ris'n to invade us, who no less
Threat'ns then our expulsion down to Hell. (II, 122-9)
Princes, Heaven's ancient Sons, ethereal Thrones—
Demonian Spirits now, from the element
Each of his reign allotted, rightlier called
Powers of Fire, Air, Water, and Earth beneath—
(So may we hold our place and these mild seats
Without new trouble!)—such an enemy...

These dashes and brackets break up a regular Miltonic apostrophe, the conclusion of which is marked by the usual semicolon. The sense is clear enough and is not rendered any clearer by the new pointing: 'You who were once Heavenly Powers but are now rightlier called Demonian Spirits, each named from the element allotted to his reign—Powers of Fire, Air, Water and Earth, so long as we can hold our place in this world! know that an enemy is arisen who threatens our possession and to drive us hence to Hell.' It is a characteristic piece of Miltonic writing, in which *rightlier call'd* governs and binds together the whole of the second, third and fourth lines, but goes primarily with *Demonian Spirits*; the revised version alters the construction by attaching the governing phrase absolutely to the succeeding words, *Powers of Fire*, etc. Clearly the revisers are dissatisfied with Milton's syntax; for, given that syntax, the punctuation cannot be improved on.

Lastly the lust for amending Milton's punctuation sometimes leads to corrupting the sense:

Nor from the Heav'n of Heav'ns
Hath he excluded my resort sometimes.
I came among the Sons of God, when he
Gave up into my hands *Uzzean Job*. (I, 366-9)
I came, among the Sons of God, when he...

This emendation is due to Knightley, as is the following:

But first I mean
 To exercise him in the Wilderness,
 There he shall first lay down the rudiments
 Of his great warfare, e're I send him forth
 To conquer Sin and Death the two grand foes,
 By Humiliation and strong Sufferance:
 His weakness shall o'ecome Satanic strength
 And all the world, and mass of sinful flesh. (I, 155-62)

... ere I send him forth
 To conquer Sin and Death, the two grand foes.
 By humiliation and strong sufferance
 His weakness shall o'ercome Satanic strength,
 And all the world, and mass of sinful flesh.

Masson pronounces this emendation 'certainly right' and quotes Knightley's comment: 'It seems quite plain that it was Satan, the world, and the flesh, that were to be overcome by humiliation and sufferance.' One would think they had never heard of the Passion; perhaps it was in their minds that Milton is said to have taken no account of it himself.

Perhaps the best comment on the whole business is what Mr Blakeney himself tells us: 'It is imperative for us to bear in mind that, in Milton's hands, blank verse is not a thing of regular and obvious scansion by common iambs.... The distinguishing feature of Milton's blank verse is the verse-paragraph; examine any page of it and you will find the poet conveying his meaning not in single lines or couplets but in subtle combinations of verses—the sense "variously drawn out."... "He steers unfaltering through the long involved passages, distributing the pauses and rests and alliterative balance with a cunning which knits the paragraph into a coherent regulated whole" (Verity).' Why then meddle with these magnificently sustained paragraphs, attempting to do them up into neat little grammatical packets of Massonic verse?

It remains to be said that Mr Blakeney's notes are always helpful and pertinent and free from fuss, and that he has added a number of valuable and interesting comments and references to those taken from previous editors.

B. A. WRIGHT.

GLASGOW.

Henry Fielding's Theory of the Comic Prose Epic. By ETHEL MARGARET THORNBURY. (*University of Wisconsin Studies.*) Madison. 1931. 202 pp.

This thesis conforms to type. It is one of the limited studies by means of which American scholarship is making its mark to-day. The plan, as with most of those theses, is excellent, starting with Fielding's library and working up from the theory of epic prevalent among the French critics to its modification in England, and its practice there. Miss Thornbury plunges almost gaily into all that matter, surely the most depressing argumentation in neo-classic criticism, and the most sterile. Its sole importance for us—for no one was going to write actual epics, or could

write them—is that it aired men's views on classical epic and, as a by-product, threw up a certain amount of readable burlesque of classical epic. Pope was the master of the verse species of epic burlesque, and Fielding essaying the prose kind, rightly claimed that he had discovered 'a new province of writing.' Some people think that this epic burlesque idea was rather a nuisance for Fielding and the novel, and I must decline Miss Thornbury's tentative invitation to consider him 'not as the first English novelist, but as the last of the Renaissance writers of epic.' To do our author justice she is aware that the epic elements in Fielding's novels do not count for much in the sum total of his art, but the contemporary discussion on the matter of epic and Fielding's own laboured treatment of the business compel her to deal faithfully with it. It is indeed an extraordinary thing to see the discussion of the new realistic novel cluttered up with lengthy talk about epical machinery and the marvellous! Naturally Fielding concludes his most impressive discussion of the matter (*Tom Jones*, book VIII, chap. 1) by repudiating for the novel all that stuff—'Man therefore is the highest subject (unless on very extraordinary occasions indeed) which presents itself to the pen of our historian, or of our poet; and in relating his actions great care is to be taken that we do not exceed the capacity of the agent we describe.' That gives us all we want.

Whilst I recognise that Miss Thornbury in choosing this particular subject had contracted to go into the whole matter of the neo-classic conception of epic, I wish that she had sometimes, here and there, indicated how mistaken the attempt was to deduce the 'laws' of the new fiction from that ancient stock. I wish she had even been a little patronising to Fielding on that side or poked fun at his labouring the matter. For there is no doubt of his sincerity in those critical places. A master of jovial irony in respect of the human scene to which he expressly limits himself, he had not sufficient irreverence to laugh at the whole epical business. This does not mean that there is not a great deal of force and acumen in those same critical places. I am referring to one aspect merely.

That apart, Miss Thornbury may be congratulated on an able and comprehensive account of the permeation of French critical ideas in the period and in especial of Fielding's reaction to these ideas.

G. KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

The Sailor in English Fiction and Drama, 1550-1800. By HAROLD FRANCIS WATSON. New York: Columbia University Press. 1931. 241 pp.

As a rule I am not fond of this type of thesis, soldier, sailor, tinker, tailor, in literature. Professor Watson, however, justifies his subject, the Sailor in Fiction and Drama. I suppose he has limited his survey to fiction and drama because of Professor Cawley's unpublished dissertation on the influence of the voyagers in non-dramatic English literature

between 1550 and 1650 (parts of which have appeared in the learned periodicals), though he does eke out his third chapter with some notes on Elizabethan sea poems. His conclusion for the Elizabethan period, and this covers poetry, fiction, and drama, is that the popular notion that Elizabethan literature teems with sea life and the spirit of the sea is a delusion. It was a great age of seamanship which the nineteenth-century poets from Tennyson to De La Mare and Masefield have bravely exploited, but the literature of the period shows little response to the glamour of the sea. What there is was governed by a formula derived from the extensive imitation of the Greek romances. I think Mr Watson unduly stresses this source of so much Elizabethan sea painting but I do not regret it—the all-pervasive influence of the classical romances in that period has not yet been sufficiently recognised. These romances passed on their borrowed finery to the dramatists. Shakespeare's scenic painting is no doubt his own, but a good subject for a thesis might be found in the kinship of much of it with that displayed so prodigally in the romances.

To illustrate this general principle Mr Watson traces what he calls the storm formula in various poems and dramas. It surprises us to find it used in such a characteristic poem as Donne's *The Storm*. The formula, which derives from Greek romance, consists, according to Mr Watson, of (1) good weather, (2) sudden wind and mountainous waves, (3) darkness and an appropriate figure of speech, (4) deafening noise, (5) fright of sailors, (6) rigging, etc., gone and final wreck. Now this mode of criticism may seem funny to some people, but let them read almost any Elizabethan wreck scene and convince themselves that the treatment of sea themes in the period was mostly conventional, and that the chief convention was that deriving from the romances. Shakespeare's *Tempest* is a case in point. It has been remarked that Spenser, who had crossed the Irish seas twice, ought to have seen the tumult of the waves with his own eyes, but in *Colin Clout's Come Home Again* (and in the *Faerie Queene* generally) his ship rides on the waves like a painted ship on a painted ocean-pure tapestry work.

This thesis gives consistency and interest to Mr Watson's study. In other ways too it satisfies. He has, it is true, the usual fault of trying to bring too many things within the scope of his thesis. For example, why drag in Petruchio as a typical old salt because of a simile or two thrown out in the dialogue? Also I am rather sceptical of the influence of the Greek romance on Fielding's *Jonathan Wild* and Smollett's *Roderick Random*.

G. KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

The English Poetic Mind. By CHARLES WILLIAMS. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1932. vii + 213 pp. 7s. 6d.

The author of this study writes with obvious conviction and interest in his subject; but it is doubtful whether he will succeed in carrying many readers with him. Analysis of Wordsworth's *Prelude* suggests the possibility of tracing analogous processes in the growth of the poetic mind as

revealed by the work of Shakespeare, Milton and the lesser hierarchy. 'The central crisis of *Troilus* is in direct relation to the culminating crisis in Wordsworth's account of his own history in the *Prelude*'; and the relation, once established, may be referred, either by comparison or contrast, to the Satan of Milton, the Nightingale of Keats, the Lancelot of Tennyson. Special pleading of this sort, if it is to be effective, demands of its exponent a rigid hold upon his argument and the greatest lucidity in exposition, neither of which Mr Williams can be said to command. The chapter on Shakespeare, occupying one-third of the book, despite fervent protestations of novelty and a good deal of suggestive comment, follows familiar lines of romantic to the exclusion of historical criticism. The treatment of Milton is more methodical and more convincing, analogy with Wordsworth, in this case, being easier to sustain. The structural weakness of the book is most evident in the thirty odd pages devoted to 'lesser poets,' under which head are included all the major Augustans, Romantics and Victorians. Even on the assumption that Wordsworth's individual self-analysis may be capable of general application Mr Williams' discursive method and mannered style scarcely do justice to his case. The result is more bewildering than enlightening.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

LONDON.

The Rossetti Family, 1825-1854. By R. D. WALLER. Manchester: University of Manchester Press. 1932. xii + 324 pp. 10s. 6d.

Students of the Rossettis have much reason to be grateful to Mr Waller for this sensitive and scholarly account of the family and its literary activities up to the year in which Gabriele Rossetti died. The book may be said to have a dual purpose: to give a fuller account than has hitherto been attempted of Gabriele himself and to relate his character and circumstances to the life and work of his children. Gabriele deserved this attention not merely for his approaches to distinction in poetry or for the interest attaching to his bizarre interpretations of Dante but because of his prominence in London society, especially the Italian element in it, during the thirty years in question; and both his own influence and that of the company which gathered round him must be considered by those who would understand the peculiar gifts and proclivities of his sons and daughters. In the earlier pages of this volume not he alone but Mrs Rossetti and the Polidoris and many other relevant personalities are recalled in singularly vitalising portraiture, which animates again the later chapters devoted severally to Maria, Dante Gabriel, William Michael, and Christina. Mr Waller has contributed something of unusual value not only to the social and literary history of England during the time of which he treats but also to the art of biography.

The story of Gabriele's career, for which Mr Waller has drawn upon neglected sources of information, notably the MS. letters in the Biblioteca del Risorgimento at Rome, is followed from its beginnings in the now rather obscure Adriatic township of Vasto, through his wanderings as a refugee first to Malta and then to London; through his marriage to

Frances Polidori and his election to the chair of Italian at King's College, to his domestic vicissitudes, his ardent uncritical theorising, and his academic occupations thereafter. It is unfortunate, in view of the tendency of individual traits to skip a generation, that so little information is available concerning Gabriele's parents, relatively to what is known of the Polidori family; but the minds and habits of Gabriele and Frances themselves, the quick enthusiastic sensibility of the one and the disciplined, repressive temperament of the other, may still seem to explain many of the mental characteristics of their children. Of the four, we are told, 'Dante Gabriel alone was unable to master his destiny', and his occasional woolly vaguenesses of style are justly accounted for as representing 'the compromise of a mind at war with itself,' unable to fuse the sensuous and the 'spiritual' elements of erotic experience in the telling language of an imagination fully alert and wholly employed. Mr Waller agrees with the present inclination among critics to place the achievement of Christina in poetry higher than that of her brother, not because she was able to hold more constant control over a nature similarly endowed ('it is a mistake to think of Christina as a passionate nature strongly curbed'), but because her genuine poetic gifts were adequate to the natural expression of her instinct for retirement and resignation, her tentative, gentle, never rebellious attitude towards the kinds of experience upon which she chose to concentrate. Mr Waller makes a strong case for his view of her personality and of the nature of her attainments in poetry; but we may still perhaps question whether the 'instinct for retirement' itself, like the restlessness and caprice of her early childhood, was not in some degree a symptom of faculties imperfectly co-ordinated and of repressive habits imposed and developed not wisely but too well.

Mr Waller's work is remarkable for the poise and delicacy of judgment which it reveals throughout, and for the quiet but incisive efficacy of its style. The printing, like the quality of the numerous illustrations, is such as may be expected from the fact that the volume belongs to the English Series in the Publications of the University of Manchester.

L. C. MARTIN.

LIVERPOOL.

Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance. A Study of the Sources of Chrestien de Troyes' 'Yvain' and other Arthurian Romances. By CHARLES BERTRAM LEWIS. London: H. Milford. 1932. xvii + 331 pp. 12s. 6d.

The task which Dr Lewis has set himself in this volume is 'to show the connexion there undoubtedly is between the "matière de Bretagne" and legends of classical mythology or practices of ancient Greek religion.' He confines himself in his argument to the romances of Chrétien de Troyes to which so often a Celtic origin has been assigned, viz., *Erec et Enide*, *Yvain*, *Lancelot* and the *Conte du Graal*. As regards the probability of a Celtic origin for any of these romances, he places himself on the side of the redoubtable W. Förster, who reserved his bitterest gibes for

the cultivators of 'der keltische Bazillus' and hoped that 'dieser unfruchtbare keltische Sport' would be finally suppressed as a result of his unceasing efforts. But, alas, the Celtic bacillus revived under the hands of his own pupil R. Zenker, who in his monumental work *Iwainstudien*, vol. I, opens up the much discussed question again and finally ends on a harmonious note by combining the classical and the Celtic theory. For him the ultimate source of the Yvain legend is the classical myth of Cybele and Atis 'mit der römischen Tradition vom Kultus der aricischen Diana verschmolzen,' and he believes that 'eine nicht erhaltene irische Erzählung von der Fahrt Cuchulinn, des Haupthelden der älteren irischen Sage, in die andere Welt' forms the connecting link between the classical and the mediæval versions. Thus 'antique elements in a Celtic dress' is the solution of the question for Rudolph Zenker, and for a brief spell this peaceful solution held sway. The present volume opens the discussion again. Dr Lewis throws his full weight into the classical scale. Nitze's theory that the cult of the Arician Diana underlies the episode of the fountain was on the right track, but insufficiently explained many of the features of Chrétien's version. Dr Lewis sees as Chrétien's first source—the story on which *Yvain* is based—the legend of Theseus and the Minotaur. Such liberties have been taken with the source as to render it almost unrecognisable, but Dr Lewis is convinced that this legend lies at the root of three important episodes in Chrétien's work, viz., the mysterious episode of 'La Joie de la Cort' in *Erec et Enide*, the first part of *Yvain* and the episode of 'Pesme Avanture' in the same poem (ll. 5108–5810). Chrétien does not hesitate to use the same material several times over, under slight disguises. It is to be seen most distinctly underlying the so-called 'Pesme Avanture' which gives this episode a certain importance in Dr Lewis' eyes: 'All the essential features of Chrétien's story seem to be inspired by the corresponding traits of the Cretan fable. The island scene, the hospitable host, the captive maidens, the monster confined to a park, the stranger knight who slays the monster and liberates the captives—are all significant traits, and if they are taken together they furnish the main features of the legend of Theseus and the Minotaur' (p. 168). Other traits common to the Theseus legend are to be seen in the Laudine episode in *Yvain*. Theseus deserts Ariadne only a short time after their marriage just as Yvain deserts Laudine. The motive of madness too was in the legend, which itself was connected with certain storm-raising rites similar to those which occur in the first part of *Yvain*.

This brings us to the fountain episode to which all the first part of Dr Lewis' book is devoted. The key to the supernatural element in Chrétien's *Yvain* is to be found in the cult of Zeus at Dodona. At some date the traditions about Dodona, which lingered long in people's memories, were transferred to the spring of Barenton in the forest of Broceliande. This supposition is confirmed by the fact that in the *Lanzelet* of Ulrich von Zatzikhofen (which is known to have affinities with Chrétien's *Yvain*) the corresponding episode is actually located at Dodona ('sin burc heizt Dôdône,' l. 331, ed. Hahn). Other details in the French poem fit into Dr Lewis' theory. The 'bacins de fer' is the gong of Zeus;

the emerald slab is the 'lapis manalis' or rain-stone connected with the ancient rain-making ceremony; Yvain himself plays the part of the rain-maker after having slain the official guardian of the spring. Chrétien has taken great liberties with his sources; in fact, if Dr Lewis' view is the right one, he has often juggled unscrupulously with them. For instance, to paint the monster herdsman in *Yvain*—who has been at different times identified with Pan (Settegast), with the deity Silvanus or Polyphemus (Zenker), the herdsman Curoi (Loomis), a Celtic personage in the 'Naissance de Concholar' (Jeanroy)—he has taken certain traits from the Minotaur and certain ones from his slayer Herakles. But this would not in the least trouble Chrétien, who does not hesitate to make one story out of two, or two out of one, to have the heads without the stakes, or the stakes without the heads (in the 'heads on stakes' episode) or both together. Similarly for Chrétien's other romances some quite surprising results emerge from Dr Lewis' investigations. For him the Grail legend is the story of Orestes, the aged King who lives on the 'oiste' being Atreus and the Fisher King Menelaus. The bleeding lance is the royal sceptre of Agamemnon, and the Grail itself is in Dr Lewis' opinion 'the golden lamb of Atreus which some writers of antiquity described as a silver bowl or cup enriched with a gold lamb in the centre of it.'

In answer to the question whence all this mass of information about ancient Greek rites and legendary Greek characters could find its way into the mediæval poet's stock in trade, Dr Lewis concludes that Chrétien's sources were probably French versions of tales brought back by pilgrims returning from the Holy Land. Certainly the Dodona legend seems to have been well known in France and Germany in the twelfth century. Accounts of the gong of Zeus were fairly numerous, but they were mostly inaccessible to the French poets (though that of Stephen of Byzantium, which is one of the most interesting, was in Latin and not in Greek as Dr Lewis supposes; cf. *Stephani Byzantini Grammatici Fragmentum de Dodone*. Ed. Gronovius). Chrétien would therefore be dependent on reminiscences of the ancient world brought back after the Crusades by the poets and soldiers who had journeyed to Constantinople, or Rome, or Crete.

It is quite impossible in a brief review to give any idea of the wealth of detail which Dr Lewis has amassed in support of his theory. It is almost overwhelming, and one recalls with fear the solemn warning uttered by Alfons Hilka in the 1926 edition of Chrétien's *Yvain* that, in treating these questions, whether one be a 'gereifter Fachmann' or a 'glaubensfreudiger Anfänger... man leicht rettungslos dem Untergange, d. h. einer starren und voreingenommenen Meinung, zusteuern kann.' We cordially hope that Dr Lewis may be preserved from such a fate.

JESSIE CROSLAND.

LONDON.

Le Haut Livre du Graal: Perlesvaus. Edited by WILLIAM A. NITZE and T. ATKINSON JENKINS. Vol. 1: Text, Variants, and Glossary. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Cambridge: University Press. 1932. xi + 537 pp. 30s.

Giglois. A French Arthurian Romance of the Thirteenth Century. Edited with an Introduction by CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1932. ix + 182 pp. 13s.

American scholarship is well maintaining its acknowledged lead in the field of Arthurianism. The two texts before us, in the handsome formats of the *University of Chicago Modern Philology Monographs* and the *Harvard Studies in Romance Languages* respectively, have long been among the desiderata of the student of the 'matter of Britain.'

The *Perlesvaus* has been long known to English readers as the 'High History of the Holy Graal' in the translation by Sebastian Evans; indeed, the late James Douglas Bruce, who held a singularly poor opinion of the literary and legendary value of the French romance, declared that the appearance of the version in a popular series had given it an artificial importance and 'a circulation much beyond its merits.' The present editors show that the work has come down to us in two redactions: an earlier, represented by MS. Hatton 82 of the Bodleian (middle of thirteenth century), upon which this new text is based; a later, represented by the Brussels manuscript (second half of thirteenth century) from which Charles Potvin published what has hitherto been the standard edition, and which is a second redaction made for the Jean de Nesle whose name appears in the colophon. Portions or fragments occur in three other French manuscripts, and there is also a Welsh translation in a manuscript of the National Library of Wales ascribed to the end of the fourteenth century, with omissions and variants which the editors here give in an Appendix.

In the *Perlesvaus*, 'the Arthurian stories are to be lifted out of the sphere of human aims and desires and be interpreted in the spirit of religion. The beau ideal of chivalry is to be, not the practice of courtly love nor the quest of mere adventure, but the militant service of Christianity' (p. 16). Nevertheless, its mysticism does not strike us as so lofty and intense as that of the *Queste*. Its date and general significance in Arthurian romance are still matters of dispute, and we must await the promised second volume, which will include a comprehensive commentary and a discussion of the relationship of the work to the Graal-Lancelot Vulgate cycle, before we know the matured views of the editors on the subject. In the Introduction, the theory—which, when set forth some years ago by Dr Nitze, by no means gained universal acceptance—is maintained; that it originated at Glastonbury, some time after 1191, in connexion with the discovery and reburial in the newly built Lady Chapel of the supposed bodies of Arthur and Guenevere. How long after that date, we are not yet told. In the meantime we are grateful for the first instalment of a highly important work.

The interest, and the manuscript provenance, of the *Giglois* are of a very different kind. The only manuscript in which it was preserved was one of those destroyed in the fire at the Biblioteca Nazionale of Turin in 1904, and Professor Livingston has here edited the text from a copy and materials left by Wendelin Foerster which were obtained for the Widener Library of Harvard University by Professor Kittredge. There is a full and excellent Introduction, and useful critical notes.

We are here dealing with a thirteenth-century poem, more or less of the type represented by the 'Breton lays' and certain Italian 'cantari,' with an Arthurian setting though outside the main line of Arthurian story, but utterly devoid of the Breton fantastic and supernatural features, and with apparently no trace of any folk-lore motive. Professor Livingston argues, rightly we think, that there are no adequate reasons for associating it, as Professor Schofield would do, with the poems of the *Bel Inconnu* or *Carduino* cycle. It is essentially a romance of courtly life in which the young hero Giglois and his magnanimous rival in love, Gawain, are the central figures, and in which 'an interest in the real' takes the place of the marvellous and fantastic. Professor Livingston would place the poem perhaps as early as the first quarter of the thirteenth century, and, on linguistic grounds, shows that the poet was from the Picard region. He has added a hitherto inaccessible text to the library of the Arthurian student.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

LONDON.

Les Études françaises dans l'enseignement en Grande-Bretagne. Par G. T. CLAPTON et WILLIAM STEWART. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 1929. 160 pp.

This book aims at giving in a convenient form a view of the study of French in its various forms in Great Britain at the present time. It is no easy matter to supply French readers with a clear and succinct description of a system (or absence of system) which must seem so chaotic to foreigners. The work is carefully documented by means of footnotes and should be of value to English readers, as well as those for whom it was specially intended. Perhaps the most interesting part is the *aperçu historique*.

The authors show how, as a result possibly of the Conquest, England was the first nation to teach French systematically. The English universities in the Middle Ages were cosmopolitan. French, though not 'Frenssh of Paris,' was there preferred to English, as it was in official and legal speech. Many French students came to Oxford, while the English were one of the four 'nations' at the University of Paris. But when, in 1362, Edward III opened Parliament in English, French had become 'desconnu en le dit realme' for pleading at least, though it left many terms behind, and was long preserved in diplomacy. From this time the influence of continental French increased; it was taught to noblemen's sons by means of manuals.

The first important French Grammar was by an Englishman, the *Esclaircissements* in 1530 of John Palsgrave, himself a student of Paris as well as a teacher in London; his works include a collection of French extracts in prose and verse and show something of the intellectual union of the English and the French celebrated by Ronsard in one of his odes. Moreover French refugees such as Sainhiens (also known as Holyband), author of 'The French Littleton,' taught French in schools of their own in England. Shakespeare learnt the language from the Huguenot Montjoy in whose house he lodged. There were Huguenot teachers at the universities, and much reading of French. In 1611 appeared Cotgrave's *Dictionary*. The Tudors were excellent French scholars, and the marriage of Charles I gave an impetus to the study, which seems however to have been considered a recreation after serious intellectual exercises. There was even some pride displayed in not knowing the language, at least in the case of those who had not yet undertaken the Grand Tour. As to the nationality of teachers, there was a prejudice against Frenchmen born enjoying a monopoly in the profession, as may be seen in the *Ortho-Epia Gallica*, the first French Grammar of note by an Englishman since Palsgrave.

During the Civil War the English frequented the Protestant schools in France then enjoying great reputation, and later the returned *émigrés* at the court of Charles II all spoke French, in fact the court was almost French in character. After 1685 Huguenot refugees opened schools or gave instruction in increasing numbers, and Pepys often mentions French churches in London as frequented by English. Locke and Hobbes placed the study of French in point of importance before that of the classics. Nevertheless, in the eighteenth century, in spite of close relations in individual cases such as Montesquieu, Voltaire, Walpole, etc., French was a dead letter in university education in England: it was either an extra, or it was learnt by travelling. Dissenting Academies seem however to have taught the subject regularly. In the wars after the Revolution of 1789 the French *émigrés* such as Chateaubriand spread a wider and better knowledge of their language and literature, and there are records which show that destitute nobles brought French culture within reach even of smaller country places in Great Britain.

In 1835 the Taylorian Institute was founded at Oxford, but not much could be done until reforms in secondary education had been carried through. After the Royal Commission on Public Schools in 1864 the need of English specialised teachers of modern languages seems to have been realised, and by degrees the 'modern sides' were developed in schools towards the close of the century. In 1886 the Mediæval and Modern Languages Tripos was instituted at Cambridge; though weighted on the philological and mediæval side, it incurred the reproach of being the 'Courier Tripos.' It has undergone various modifications and reforms, especially in 1917, when it became the Modern and Mediæval Languages Tripos, the philological and mediæval parts having been made optional. The Oxford Honours School of Modern Languages dates from 1903.

Such are the main points in the historical survey of French studies in

this country, the last part dealt with being further developed in the chapter on Higher Education. Here the same questions to some extent are shown to be confronting university authorities both in France and England; the equivalence in point of discipline and culture of the 'modern' and the older classical studies; the limit of date to be set to 'modern' literary studies; the whole position and even existence of mediæval and philological parts in a first degree course; the language to be used in lectures and examinations; the result of the decrease in the study of Latin; the value of oral translations into the mother tongue, with the type of 'explanations' to be adopted, historical and critical; the need of prolonged residence abroad in the case of Honours students, and so forth. There is an attempt to explain the different value of the Doctorates and Master's degrees of the different English universities, as well as the varied connotation of such titles as Vice-Chancellor. With regard to examinations, the Pass or General, though nominally a continuation of the mediæval baccalaureate, corresponds more nearly to the Licence, while the French Baccalauréat (apart from the 'composition de philosophie') is now on a par with our Higher Certificate.

In the above review note has been principally taken of the passages relating to England, rather than to those concerning the whole of Great Britain, and attention has been concentrated on the historical aspect of the subject, particularly with reference to higher French studies. The other parts, however, will be found useful for English readers. The influence of the Modern Language Association in encouraging research and endowments has not been forgotten, and such recent developments as the British Institute in Paris find their place in the summing up of present-day tendencies. The footnotes throughout give references to authorities consulted or quoted, these might with advantage be collected in a special bibliographical note.

F. C. JOHNSON.

LONDON.

Epanáforas de vária História Portuguesa. By D. FRANCISCO MANUEL DE MELLO. Edited with notes by EDGAR PRESTAGE. (*Scriptores Rerum Lusitanarum*, Série C.) 3rd ed. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade. 1931. xii + 463 pp.

The Chronicles of Fernão Lopes and Gomes Eannes de Zurara. By EDGAR PRESTAGE. Watford: Voss and Michael. 1928. 99 pp. With 5 illustrations and 2 maps. 10s. 6d.

Fernão Lopes. Por AUBREY F. G. BELL. Tradução do inglês de ANTÓNIO ÁLVARO DÓRIA. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade. 1931. xx + 64 pp.

Letters of John III, King of Portugal (1521-1557). The Portuguese text edited with an introduction by J. D. M. FORD. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. xxx + 408 pp. 15s.

During more than forty years Professor Prestage has devoted a special

cult to the memory of his great predecessor in the study of the Portuguese seventeenth century, D. Francisco Manuel de Mello, of whom he has already been the definitive biographer (Coimbra: Imp. da Univ., 1914). There is an identity, or close approximation, of temperaments; for as historians both are grave and informative writers, addicted to the monograph as the fittest medium for erudition, and reverent towards documents. The difference of the centuries even disappears at times, for Mello is strangely modern. Though a devoted Catholic, he would exclude men of religion from affairs, as he feels that diplomacy and politics are specialised undertakings. Very modern is his manner of brushing aside the 'philosophy of history' (or any other device for schematising human experience) by pointing out that circumstances always differ. The *Epanáforas* are not, in the editor's judgment, the high-watermark of Mello's work as an historian or as a moralist, but they have the interest of relating to affairs within his own experience. He took part in some negotiations connected with the disturbances at Evora in 1637, was one of the few survivors of the great storm which caught the Spanish armada of 1627, was present at the battle of the Downs in 1639 when van Tromp put an end to the sea-power of Spain (and later had occasion to discuss the fight with the victor), and reached Brazil one year after the surrender of the Dutch garrison at Pernambuco in 1654. The subject of his fourth narrative—the discovery of Madeira—was at least associated with the history of his own family, though he has chosen to treat it as a sentimental romance. The word *Epanáforas* is better rendered in the sub-title by *Relações*. 'Relations' are a genre in Hispanic historiography which have perhaps not received the separate attention they deserve. As against the erudite parade and rhetorical emphasis of history, these 'Relations' are distinguished by their ease ('quando a historia sem advertencia chegava ao fim de sua acção, havendo de caminho informado aos leitores de tudo o que lhe pertencia'); and an author may, like Herrera, change his style very considerably in passing from this type of report to more formal writing. A genre which contains Mello's *Epanáforas*, Herrera's *Guerra de Chipre* and Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola's account of the suppression of Aragonese rights, has a great record of achievement.

Among the Portuguese chroniclers in the 'esquadra dos velhos' Mello appears to have preferred Zurara, who is also better known in England, owing to Professor Prestage's rendering of the *Conquista de Guiné*. Professor Prestage called our attention to these fathers of Portuguese history in 1928; and in the *Hispanic Monographs* Mr Bell made a special plea for Lopes. It is to be feared that these seeds have fallen on stonier ground among us than in Portugal, where Snr Dória assures us that an active interest in the 'best chronicler of all times and nations' (who is also the best prose-writer in Portuguese) has been aroused by Mr Bell's missionary effort. He echoes Mr Bell's complaint about the late Snr Braamcamp Freire's edition, that its retention of an antiquated spelling terrifies the Portuguese reader. Popular editions are greatly to be desired. But, as they must be based on a properly established text, it is clearly a first duty to complete Snr Braamcamp Freire's critical undertaking.

Nor are these spellings gratuitous. On the contrary, a palace manuscript of the type of Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 20946 has norms as well established as those of a modern Portuguese text; so that when the scribe, to Mr Bell's annoyance, wrote *geeraçom* for the modern *geração*, we have to suppose he is conveying definite information about the language of his day (and, specifically, that the sense of quantitative difference lasted after the loss of the nasal and consequent reduction of two identical vowels to one). Some Portuguese scholars¹ have accepted the view which Mr Bell advanced (after Braamcamp Freire and Esteves Pereira), that Fernão Lopes was the author of the *Chronica do Condestabre*, large passages of which he has incorporated without acknowledgement into his own work. Mr Bell rightly put on one side the argument that there was either identity of authorship or plagiarism in this proceeding; but he asked, 'Can there be two Fernão Lopes in one generation?' Differences of style led him to think the author of the *Chronica do Condestabre* to be an earlier, immature Lopes. Close attention to the text of the *Crónica de D. João I* convinces me that there were not two Lopes in that generation, indeed, but a considerable school of Portuguese historians of the War of Liberation, treating parts of the one general subject according to a generally similar technique. 'Dr Christoforus' wrote in Latin, with a special leaning towards set speeches, and the ambassador Fogaça seems to have originated narratives used by Lopes (negotiations at Windsor) and Froissart (second account of Aljubarrota, mediated by João Fernández Pacheco); and there are various anonymous narratives cited by Lopes. Lopes treats the chronicler of the Holy Constable as he treats Ayala. Taking all three reigns, Lopes has probably taken more chapters from the Castilian writer (without either losing his identity or being guilty of plagiarism in so doing). He rejects the testimony of the *Chronica do Condestabre* on one occasion (on the ground of partisanship), just as he rejects on another that of Ayala. The battle of Aljubarrota in the *Chronica do Condestabre* reads like the work of an eyewitness; Lopes assures us he was not present on that field. The Constable's biographer formed part of the household when it was reduced to a skeleton on account of the hero's mental disorder; on the other hand he possessed only the most summary information about certain campaigns which Lopes could report in great detail.

The letters of João III reach from 1523 to 1557. They are addressed almost wholly to his *vedor da fazenda*, the Count of Castanheira, and we do not possess the replies. They are of no literary or artistic interest, but display the world-wide activities of this merchant prince and are a necessary complement to the two chronicles of his reign. Further letters by members of the royal family are also contained in the Palha collection at Harvard, and Professor Ford purposes to print them. In doing so it would be most desirable to insert an *Index Nominum* and *Index Rerum* to the whole cartulary, as lack of them makes the collection unduly clumsy for reference. It is hardly necessary to trouble with a *Glossary*, where the differences between this and modern Portuguese are scarcely more than scribal. It is quite desirable to punctuate works of the period ac-

¹ But not Dr H. Cidade (see *O. Instituto*, LXXI, 1931).

cording to modern norms, and to break up the 'loosely periodic' style of the manuscripts; seeing that the manuscripts themselves indicate pauses, though in ways too various for print. In reducing abbreviations, I personally prefer to render the 'til' by *m*, rather than leave it in positions where it conflicts with modern usage. *Sam* and *são* are still recognisably the same sound, but not so Professor Ford's *Sũ*. The London MS. of Fernão Lopes is equally decisive in rendering the 2nd pers. plur. of *E*-verbs by *-ees* or *-es*, but not by *-eis*, a form which has been restored by the analogy of *-ais*, *-is*. *V* is written in a number of these documents with a long upright stroke on the left side, often curved or hooked to the right, and scarcely different from *b*; but I do not think that *bui*, for instance, was the reading intended for the numeral *viii*, and I feel sceptical also of Professor Ford's *bespora* for *véspera*. On the other hand, the Lopes MS. bears unequivocal witness to *poboo* (POPULUS), with *b*, while Professor Ford reads, as with modern usage, *povoo* or *povo*. The letters are handsomely printed and there is a useful introduction.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

The Life and Work of Goethe. By J. G. ROBERTSON. London: G. Routledge. 1932. ix + 350 pp. 12s. 6d.

Goethe as revealed in his Poetry. By BARKER FAIRLEY. London: J. M. Dent. 1932. vii + 210 pp. 8s. 6d.

Goethe a Century after. By F. W. FELKIN. London: H. Milford. 1932. 84 pp. 3s. 6d.

It was an admirable and timely thought which prompted the English Goethe Society to issue a volume by its president as a centenary gift to its members, for none has been more closely associated with the Society during the last thirty years than Professor Robertson, and no one has done more to revive the serious study of Goethe in this country than the senior Professor of German in the University of London. The preface contains at the same time the melancholy reminder that this is the last year during which its author will remain on the active list; his *Goethe* and his *History of German Literature* will keep his memory green among lovers of German literature for many years to come.

The present volume, which is an amplification of the author's *Goethe* published six years ago in *The Republic of Letters*, steers a middle course between the specialist and the general public. It is, as the title implies, an account of Goethe, the Man, as well as of Goethe, the Artist. In fact the human interest looms very large: it was not for nothing, as Professor Robertson tells us in his preface, that he began as a disciple of Carlyle. He sees the value of Goethe for the modern world in the example that he gave of how a man, through constant struggle and wise limitation, may conquer the world and learn to believe in its goodness: we must in Goethe's words 'daily conquer our life anew.' There is perhaps an echo of Carlyle in the regret that Goethe did not make a more noble marriage. It might be argued on the other hand that Christiane supplied the erotic

satisfaction which left the poet at liberty to follow his intellectual pursuits free from the clogging impediments of an all-absorbing love. Frau von Stein may, indeed, have provided the 'Glück der nächsten Nahe,' but it is significant that the years of her domination are the least fertile in the poet's career.

Professor Robertson deplores the fact that Goethe should have wasted so much time on other than literary pursuits. But this is to judge Goethe primarily as a professional poet, whereas all his poetry, as he himself tells us, was spontaneous and could not be written to order. He was concerned not with what posterity might think of him as a poet, but rather with the full development of his personality, to which poetry was but one avenue, and in his eyes not even the most important avenue. Hence he accepted the invitation to Weimar contrary to his father's wishes rather than remain in Frankfurt to become a German Shakespeare or a German Rousseau.

It is almost superfluous to add that Professor Robertson is well acquainted with the vast literature on Goethe which has poured from the German presses of late in anticipation of the centenary of the poet's death. He has indeed made some important contributions to it himself, as when he showed in a recent paper to the Goethe Society that the German poet was by no means the first to conceive the 'reine Menschlichkeit' of Iphigenie and its healing properties. But Professor Robertson has obviously little sympathy with the new philosophic approach which looms so large in modern Germany. His criticism is thoroughly objective, inspired by the sanity which comes from a wide acquaintance with the literature of Europe and which can see his hero's failures as well as his achievements. A valuable and up-to-date bibliography provides the student with all the material necessary for further study. Robertson's *Goethe* is easily the most reliable and authoritative account of the poet which we possess in English. It is but fitting that the author should have been selected to represent English scholarship at the centenary celebrations held in Weimar last March.

The volume with which Professor Fairley inaugurates the tenure of the chair of German at Manchester is not light reading. This could scarcely be expected of a critic who 'seeks the difference between Goethe and other men at a metaphysical depth.' The method of approach is frankly that of the philosophic-æsthetic school so popular in Germany to-day, with all its advantages and all its defects. It assumes a knowledge of the facts of Goethe's life and times and its appeal must necessarily be restricted to the specialist. Even the latter would occasionally be glad of direct references to the author's sources, for it is obvious that Professor Fairley is in the debt of previous workers in the field, not only to Chamberlain and Gundolf, but to the whole school of æstheticians which has arisen in Germany since the War. From Simmel, in particular, he has adopted much of the philosophic phraseology which at times makes the argument difficult to follow.

Professor Fairley shows how Goethe's poetic career was the experience of one form of poetic sensibility after another in the constant endeavour

to extend his poetic consciousness. All objective experience was his concern, and poetry was but one of the many points of contact in which he was close to the process of nature: hence the passionate enthusiasm with which he could write on geology or botany, and the fact that he set no more store by his poetry than by his other scientific and artistic activities. But on that account he was perhaps the truer poet, for poetry was not a profession or a hobby, but a natural function as indispensable as food and sleep, the liberation from a state of emotional crisis, a reckoning with himself—it is in this sense that he could speak of it as a ‘confession.’ This explains the spontaneity of Goethe’s great poetry, and it accounts too for some of its difficulty, because in most cases we are presented with these poems as he composed them in his mind, without thought of an audience. It is Goethe ‘off his guard,’ letting us into his innermost secrets and, at the same time, showing us the inner reality of which only a poet can penetrate the inwardness, through the external attributes. All this Goethe saw more clearly than our modern Impressionists professed to see. Goethe’s poetry is the poetry of a realm of universals.

Professor Fairley’s criticism is both penetrating and stimulating, and we feel after reading it that we have lived with Goethe through the mood or emotion of which his poetry was the immediate expression. Such criticism is necessarily personal and subjective, and it is of course very easy to disagree with it: the book would not be so valuable if it were not so provocative. In the first place, Goethe was not primarily a metaphysician, nor are his poems, or even his greatest poems, by any means of the philosophic order which one would gather from reading Professor Fairley’s book: *Willkommen und Abschied*, *Married*, *Neue Liebe, neues Leben*, *Rastlose Liebe*, *Wanderers Nachtlied* and dozens more of simple lyrics need no deep philosophic training to appreciate their beauty; *Egmont*, *Hermann und Dorothea*, the first part of *Faust* appeal even to the English schoolboy. Great poetry is not necessarily difficult poetry, nor does mere profundity make for greatness. Often enough it is the critic who introduces the difficulty by reading into the text far more than the author ever meant to convey. The unity of *Faust* was an afterthought of Goethe’s, and it is obvious that a poem which was sixty years in the making and was the reaction to the sharply diverging phases of the intellectual and spiritual life of its author, could not possess Classical harmony either of thought or form. And yet Professor Fairley makes still one more brave plea for the harmonious reading of the poem. He finds its key in the adjustment of autobiography to myth, and myth to autobiography. He considers that the drama should be read lyrically as a sequence of moods and impulses incidental to one mind. This involves him, of course, into denying dramatic individuality to the figures in the poem who are conceived as embodiments of their author’s personal emotions. But though this may be true enough of the second part, it is surely inapplicable to such realistic figures as Gretchen and Martha and to the very human devil of the *Ur-Faust*. In support of this theory it is ingenious to claim the ‘Walpurgisnacht’ as a nightmare, the natural

sequence of Gretchen's swoon in the cathedral. But if so, the vision is rather the product of Faust's subconscious mind than of Gretchen's. As it stands the 'Walpurgisnacht' is full of loose ends and unresolved contradictions: the trivialities and irrelevancies of the 'Intermezzo' will not fit in with any theory and, as the title implies, were to have been followed by a grandiose scene on the Brocken in which Faust was to have learned of Gretchen's fate. By shifting the cathedral scene to its present place Goethe has hopelessly confused the chronology of events.

Again Professor Fairley is eloquent on the harmonious fusion of the ancient and modern spirit in *Iphigenie*. But Iphigenie does not close her eyes to the conflict between her faith and her dogma: it is on the contrary very much before her, and nowhere is the revolt against the old order so tragically brought out as in her defiant speech to the gods: 'Rettet euer Bild in meiner Seele!' If the issue is conciliatory it is because Goethe conceived of the tragic catharsis as 'eine aussöhnende Abrundung.' Goethe's drama is thus in a sense the anticipation of the Romantic tragedy in which not death but life is the culmination. Orest passes through the valley of the shadow of death to a new life, and does not Tasso consider the allegory of the silkworm as an example of the fate which may be ours when death awakens us to new life? Little wonder that Adam Müller, the Romantic theorist, saw in Goethe the precursor of the Christian drama of Werner or of certain aspects of the drama of Kleist.

Professor Fairley is at his best in the analysis of Goethe's deeper metaphysical poems: *Trilogie der Leidenschaft*, *Um Mitternacht*, *Harzreise im Winter*, and his renderings of some of these difficult passages are very happy. He has lived long and intimately with Goethe and has caught the inwardness of his poetry and the import of his message. He writes with a command of English which renders his difficult matter less difficult, and often crystallises into memorable phrases. It is admittedly but one side of Goethe that is presented here, the creative artist in poetry; and, as we know, that was not in Goethe's eyes even the most important of his many interests, but few English books on Goethe have presented that side with such authority and admirable restraint.

Mr Felkin is also concerned primarily with the metaphysical background of Goethe's poetry which he traces in the last resort to Plato through the mediation of Spinoza and Hamann. Goethe's conception of 'das Ganze im Kleinen,' his visions of the permanent elements in changing nature, his apprehension of the 'Ur-phänomen,' and the instinct by which the poet can at times see deep into the 'Weltseele,' all this Mr Felkin refers to the Greek philosopher and his realm of Universals. In his enthusiasm for Greek literature Mr Felkin's sympathies are definitely with the Goethe of the middle years (i.e., 1779-1805) which he describes as 'incomparably the most important and prolific part of his life.' He finds the greatest achievements of Goethe in *Iphigenie*, *Tasso* and *Hermann und Dorothea* without asking himself whether they are really Greek or pseudo-classical. Nor does he stop to distinguish between Goethe's conception of the Greeks as represented say by *Prometheus*

and the Helena episode in *Faust*, which, after all, are worlds apart. He mentions the fact that Goethe preferred his own *Hermann und Dorothea* in its Latin translation without deducing the obvious inference. He does less than justice to *Werther* which is definitely something more than a pathological novel and reflects the feelings and aspirations of an age, and he is inclined to over-estimate *Wilhelm Meister* because it is the antithesis of *Werther* and preaches renunciation 'instead of false national feeling.' *Götz* is praised as the 'source of the modern historical romance,' but *Faust* is only mentioned twice, and that cursorily, in the course of these pages, while there is practically no reference to the lyrical poems. Mr Felkin is scarcely at home in the latest developments of German criticism although he quotes frequently and aptly from older critics like the Schlegels, Gervinus and Schöll. (But who is Paul Klauke? and what a strange bedfellow is Herman Merivale to Kuno Fischer!) Mr Felkin is stimulating in the analysis of Goethe's poetic genius, and his obviously wide knowledge and intuitive appreciation of poetry make his analyses of *Iphigenie* and *Tasso* good reading. But he is too intent on claiming all that is great in Goethe to Classical influence to merit the consideration which a less one-sided view of literature would deserve.

L. A. WILLOUGHBY.

LONDON.

ERICH FRANZ. *Goethe als religiöser Denker*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. xi + 286 pp. 12 M. 50.

HEINRICH RICKERT. *Goethes Faust: die dramatische Einheit der Dichtung*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. xvi + 544 pp. 21 M.

Encouraged no doubt by the philosophical turn that German literary studies have taken in recent years, philosophers are venturing more and more frequently on domains that used to be considered the preserves of the Germanist. That such work can be very valuable was proved long ago by Dilthey and Simmel. The books which the philosophers Franz and Rickert have published for the Goethe centenary prove once more how valuable the habit of precise thinking and a philosophical background are, especially if they are combined, as they are in these two writers, with a full knowledge of the older philological methods and results. As compared with literary studies of the older type, both lay more stress on synthesis, on the search for an underlying unity in Goethe's work and thought, and both have hard things to say sometimes about the abuses of the 'historical' method and its often rather arbitrary distinctions between the work of different periods. They insist on the necessity of avoiding a too literal interpretation of their author, of reading every statement in its context and of interpreting a work as far as possible through the text itself and not through what happens to be known about its history. These ideas are of course commonplaces of the now fashionable 'Geistesgeschichte,' but its exponents do not always produce work as solid and as clearly written as these two volumes.

The guiding principles of the work of Franz, laid down in his preface, are that a more critical use must be made of the sources, that Goethe

must be taken seriously as a philosopher and that he must be regarded, not as a 'representative man,' but as an extremely complex personality. After an introductory chapter discussing Goethe's claims to consideration as a thinker, his personality, the history of his religious experience and the relative value of his various writings bearing on religion, Franz boldly faces the difficulty of the complexity of Goethe's mind in a long chapter headed 'Religion und Ironie.' He describes Goethe as 'seelisch differenziert, ironisch überlegen, geistig aristokratisch' and brings out the unique character of his religious thought by a 'phenomenological' survey of the many attitudes to the world of values that have been adopted by different men at different times, ranging from devoted belief, through respectful understanding, to that ironical playing with alternative systems of ideas that he looks upon as typically Romantic. Goethe's was not an age when any traditional religion could be accepted by a man like him in simple faith, and though he understood and respected the fundamental truth that he considered all developed religions to contain, his reserve where his deepest beliefs were concerned, his sense of humour and his intellectual sprightliness often made him seem more ironical than he really was and brought him nearer to Wieland than to Schiller, whose 'Pathos' was quite foreign to him. In a survey of Goethe's ironical references to religion a masterly analysis of the *Prometheus* ode is particularly noticeable.

In the next chapter, 'Religion als Ehrfurcht,' we come to the core of Goethe's positive beliefs. A careful analysis of the famous chapters in the *Wanderjahre* reveals a most important body of ideas, here convincingly interpreted and freed from certain incidental obscurities. Subsequent chapters present Goethe's views on the psychology of religion, with a very illuminating study of what Goethe meant by 'Das Dämonische,' on the history of religion, including a subtle analysis of the relevant passages in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*—passages which, according to Franz, give us Goethe's conception of the historical growth of religion rather than the history of his own development—and on the philosophy of religion. 'Die elementarste Voraussetzung für das Verständnis von Goethes Religionsphilosophie,' says Franz, 'ist die Erkenntnis, dass er eine absolute und relative Betrachtung des Göttlichen sorgfältig unterscheidet.' Nature and life are at bottom, regarded 'absolutely,' utterly mysterious, but there is a place for a 'relative' view, such as is suggested for instance in the ode *Das Göttliche*, even though its anthropomorphism must be considered a purely symbolic, not a literal truth. The close analogy with Goethe's theory of knowledge, his view of truth as that which is fruitful, that which makes experience 'kopfrecht' for us, is insisted upon. One is reminded too of this distinction between the absolute and the relative when later in the book Goethe's 'optimism' is described as being 'von unten her,' the attitude of a man who, while entertaining no comfortable illusions, would make the best of 'Vernunft und Wissenschaft' and all that life can offer. It is the expression, one might say, not of a belief about the nature of existence so much as of an attitude of the will or of a natural buoyancy of temperament.

The comparisons between Goethe and other German thinkers which are a feature of the book culminate in a consideration of the relation in which present-day thought stands to Goethe. Nietzsche's philosophy of religion is described as 'ein Vergrößerungsspiegel, in welchem die feineren Linien der Goetheschen Gedanken weit stärker und schärfer hervortreten, eben darum manches aber verzerrt erscheint.' This work of Franz, one may say, is very clearly post-Nietzschean. Nietzsche has helped us to understand Goethe. Franz considers that Goethe anticipated the essential feature of the 'dialectic theology' of the school of Barth, its feeling for the 'mysterium tremendum.' 'Er hütet sich aber sorgfältig vor der schweren Verirrung, die darin liegt, dass für dies unbekannte X nun mit einer verblüffenden Kritiklosigkeit die ganze Erbmasse der biblischen und dogmatischen Überlieferung eingesetzt wird.' In the philosophy of religion, the author thinks, we have still much to learn from the German classics.

In a short concluding chapter on 'Goethes persönlicher Glaube' his 'Naturverbundenheit' is singled out as the outstanding feature of his thought and feeling; his 'Weltfrömmigkeit,' his repudiation of any religion that separates value from existing reality is once more insisted upon and his recorded views on the immortality of the soul and on the belief in providence are interpreted in a way which makes them consistent with the rest of his beliefs. It will be seen that the range of this book is very wide. It is well planned, clearly written and well documented. The author faces every issue with complete honesty. This book takes us to the centre of Goethe's thought and personality and fills us with admiration for his wisdom and insight.

Professor Rickert sets out to enquire how far Goethe was right in thinking that his completed *Faust* was a real whole, and in particular whether *Faust* possesses dramatic unity in the sense that there is a single theme for the action of both parts. He is not content with the genetic explanations of *Faust* in the light of Goethe's personal development, conceived, as it was, by the historical school, rather melodramatically. He thinks that the completed work, read as it stands, possesses far more unity than is commonly thought. Its central theme is stated in the 'Prolog im Himmel.' It is, in brief, to justify the ways of man. The novelty of Rickert's treatment lies in his interpretation of certain central scenes, the pact scene, for instance, and the concluding scenes of Part II (some of these chapters have appeared in periodicals), and in his vision of the work as a whole, of the underlying unity in all the variations of Faust's character that are revealed as the drama proceeds. It becomes apparent that Goethe does not mean all our sympathies to be with Faust any more than with Tasso. Faust remains the 'Übermensch' he was at the beginning, but Rickert sees three stages in the action, leading naturally one to the other, the 'Gretchenragödie,' the 'Helenatragödie' and the 'Herrschertragödie.' In each stage Faust's wilfulness leads him into morally indefensible actions, but his energy remains unbroken and his guilt itself purifies him.

There are many difficulties. 'Wald und Höhle' is a crux, with its

'Erhabener Geist,' who, Rickert insists, is not the Erdgeist. If he were, and Mephistopheles were his emissary, we should be obliged to give up all hope of reconciling this scene with the 'Prolog im Himmel' and abandon the attempt to find dramatic unity in *Faust* as a whole. But Rickert urges that the few phrases here and in the scene 'Trüber Tag, Feld' which have suggested the Erdgeist hypothesis have been given too much weight, that the interrelations of the supernatural beings in *Faust* were not logically thought out but rightly left vague. One might say too, taking a hint from what Franz tells us of Goethe himself, that when Faust feels the need for prayer he does not choose a name for 'der ewig Ungenannte' with the precision of a theologian. 'Es kommt Goethe gar nicht darauf an, ob er "Gott" oder "Natur" sagt, "Schicksal" oder "himmlischer Vater," ob er sagt "die Götter" oder—nach Fichtes Atheismusstreit—"die moralische Weltordnung." In jedem Falle ist damit dasselbe gemeint.' The Helena tragedy provides another difficulty. Here, according to Rickert, Euphorion has to take his father's place for the moment as the centre of interest. It is *his* 'Masslosigkeit' which brings the dream of beauty to an end. But these and other difficulties are inherent in the task that Professor Rickert has undertaken, and his commentary on the thought content of the drama is, in spite of them, the most complete and helpful that has yet appeared. In form it is close to the lectures from which it originated. It is a long book, not so tightly packed with matter as that of Franz, but more easily read.

W. H. BRUFORD.

EDINBURGH.

Ludwig Tieck and England: a Study in the Literary Relations of Germany and England during the Early Nineteenth Century. By EDWIN H. ZEYDEL. Princeton: University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. vii + 264 pp. \$ 2.75.

Tieck's Romantic Irony, with Special Emphasis upon the Influence of Cervantes, Sterne and Goethe. By A. E. LUSKY. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; London: H. Milford. ix + 274 pp. \$ 3.00.

Professor Edwin H. Zeydel, whom we associate particularly with work on Tieck in America, has given us a comprehensive and furthering book on Tieck's relations to England. The field has not hitherto been covered as a whole, and Professor Zeydel does so with exemplary thoroughness, utilising a good deal of unpublished material. His investigations are grouped under the headings 'Tieck and English Literature,' 'Tieck in England,' 'English Visitors and Correspondents,' 'Tieck's Library' and 'The Appreciation of Tieck and his Writings in England.' Quite new ground is broken in the last of these sections, a particularly interesting contribution to Anglo-German literary relations. Professor Zeydel also gives us a good summary of Tieck's participation in Schlegel's Shakespeare translation. I offer a few comments which have occurred

to me in reading the volume. Chapter I, p. 2: Borck's translation of *Julius Cæsar* is not in hexameters. On the problematic influence of Lillo's *Fatal Curiosity* (p. 5) Professor Zeydel might with advantage have consulted an article in this *Review* (xviii, pp. 449 ff.). 'Possibly,' he says (p. 15), 'the name of William Lovell is traceable to . . . Jonson's comedy *The New Inn*'; years ago I remember reading an anonymous English novel of the eighteenth century bearing this title at the British Museum in the hope—which was disappointed—of finding in it a source of Tieck's novel; but it may have suggested to him the name of his hero. I am not convinced that 'in his imaginative works Tieck constantly strove to banish all subjectivism' (p. 34, repeated p. 92); no one at least could say that he succeeded. On p. 42 there is an implication that Scott's *Tales of my Landlord* is one book. I cannot agree with Professor Zeydel's high estimate of *Vittoria Accorombona* (p. 44). Why is the famous actress's name written 'Miss O'Neal' (p. 60)? Professor Zeydel has an exaggerated idea of Crabb Robinson's knowledge of German literature (p. 114); see Mr F. Norman's recent volumes published by the English Goethe Society. Tieck's marginal notes on the books from his library which have passed to the British Museum have not yet been fully examined by Tieck specialists, but as far as my own perusal of them has gone, the harvest is scanty.

Notwithstanding a painstaking collection of materials bearing on Romantic irony, I am doubtful whether Professor Lussky's volume brings us much nearer to a solution of the much debated question: what is Romantic irony? Indeed, the most conspicuous conclusion which emerges from the book is that Tieck's conception of this specific form of irony was not Friedrich Schlegel's. If *Der gestiefelte Kater* is to be regarded as the acme of Tieck's irony, this is surely merely irony *sans phrase*. Tieck had, in the ordinary sense of the word, a strong ironic vein in his composition which accounts for his warm love of Cervantes and Sterne. When, however, Professor Lussky completes the trio of ironists by adding the author of *Wilhelm Meister*, I cannot follow him. No one would have been more surprised than Goethe to have been told that he had written a conspicuously ironic novel. Excerpt after excerpt is quoted here to show how Goethe obtrudes his personality on his story, but many of the examples do not admit of an ironical interpretation at all; Goethe is merely following the universal practice of writers of the eighteenth century and long after, by inserting his own comment on persons and events.

For the precise conception of Romantic irony Friedrich Schlegel provides more helpful material; and I have read many pages of this section of Professor Lussky's book with real satisfaction. But when he seeks to identify Friedrich Schlegel's 'das Interessante' with his idea of irony, I again find it difficult to accompany him. It seems to me that Professor Lussky would have been wiser first to clear the ground by considering how far the use of the term irony—as well as of 'das Interessante'—coincides with the ordinary meaning attachable to it and, having eliminated such use, only then have attacked his particular problem. One result, I venture to think, would have been to show that

Tieck has made very little contribution indeed to the formulation of the debatable and elusive thing labelled 'Romantic irony.'

J. G. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

PAUL VAN TIEGHEM. *La Littérature comparée*. Paris: A. Colin. 1931. 222 pp. 10 fr. 50, *Le Prérromantisme*. Paris: Felix Alcan. 1930. 324 pp. 30 fr.

The small handy volume of the *Collection Arnaud Colin* is an excellent sample of the good work now being done in France on problems of literary history. It begins with an original and well documented account of the rise, development and present position of studies in comparative literature, understood as the mutual interaction of literatures. The author is rich in new and suggestive points of view, indicating where fields still remain undeveloped and where co-ordination of effort would produce a better yield. Even more important perhaps are the last chapters on general literature which break almost entirely fresh ground. Literary historians, it is suggested, should follow the example of the historians who not only study each country as a separate unit but make surveys of European and world-wide movements in their totality.

Par-delà les histoires littéraires nationales, première étape nécessaire, par-delà la littérature comparée qui les fait communiquer deux à deux, et en rend intelligibles bien des parties, une troisième discipline intervient pour atteindre de plus près et plus complètement la réalité historique, en achevant le travail de synthèse commencé par les deux premières: c'est la littérature générale.... Sont du domaine de la littérature générale les faits d'ordre littéraire qui appartiennent à la fois à plusieurs littératures.... Ce sera tantôt une influence internationale: Pétrarquisme, Voltairianisme, Rousseauisme, Byronisme, Tolstoïsme, Gidisme, tantôt un courant plus anonyme d'idées, de sentiments, d'art: humanisme, classicisme, rationalisme, romantisme, sentimentalisme, naturalisme, symbolisme; tantôt une forme commune d'art ou de style: sonnet, tragédie classique, drame romantique, roman rustique, préciosité, l'art pour l'art, etc. Le but essentiel reste toujours de reconnaître... les états communs et successifs de la pensée et de l'art dans les grands groupes de nations de civilisation à peu près comparable.... C'est par la recherche patiente et le rapprochement minutieux de textes plus ou moins analogues qu'on peut arriver à écrire l'histoire précise d'une tendance ou d'une forme.... Elle laisse aux historiens des littératures nationales tout ce qui est isolé, soit personnel, soit local, et resté sans échos au-delà des frontières, si grand qu'en soit d'ailleurs l'intérêt.

A small chapter of European literary history is embodied in the second of the works under review. It examines the part played by Young's *Night Thoughts* and Gessner's *Idylls* in preparing European sensibility for the great outburst of Romanticism. Certain points made in the more general handbook are well illustrated in this detailed study. The translator or adapter, for instance, is a vital element in the transmission of a foreign influence, sometimes eclipsing the original. France knew Young's *Night Thoughts* through the distorting medium of Le Tourneur's adaptation. Again, an author may appeal quite differently to different countries or even to different generations in the same country. A comprehensive survey of Shakespeare's influence abroad would illustrate both these points. Such a study can omit none of the so-called minor

literatures from its purview. It shows the minor literature of yesterday becoming the emittive centre of to-morrow. In modern times Italy, Spain, France, England, Germany, Norway, Russia have in their turn been givers. The time-lag in the reception of an influence by any one literature is an indication of its distance at any given period from the active centre of the moment.

These few points singled out from a wealth of good things may serve to show the value of these two studies both to specialists and to a wider public of readers interested in European literature as a whole.

I. M. MASSEY.

LONDON.

SHORT NOTICES

The Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature, Volume XI (Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes. 1931. 232 pp. 7s. 6d.), which Dr Mary Serjeantson edits for the Modern Humanities Research Association, is as indispensable as ever. The Association and all English scholars owe much to Dr Serjeantson's devotion, and to the labours of the corps of collaborators enlisted by her in various countries, above all to Professor L. N. Broughton, now Associate-Editor of the Bibliography, who is responsible for the abundant American material. Section XII now includes an additional sub-section on Topography and Genealogy, a welcome addition. The Bibliography, as far as I have been able to test it, is both exhaustive and accurate, and the index adequate. I observe, however, that the index under 'Collitz' refers us to an article by him in a Festschrift but not to the Festschrift (No. 209) in his honour. I still regret that important reviews cannot be indexed. It would be very desirable to have ready reference to those of Dr Greg, for example, or of Sir E. K. Chambers, which are often notable contributions to learning.

C. J. S.

The Year's Work in English Studies, Volume XI (London: H. Milford. 1932. 400 pp. 10s. 6d.), covers the work of the year 1930. This critical survey, the gift of the English Association to scholarship, continues to be a useful guide and companion to students of English, who profit by the labours of Dr Boas, its editor, and his distinguished collaborators. Dr Boas has added to his responsibilities this year by taking over from Professor Reed the chapter on the Renaissance. Professor Abercrombie resumes command of Literary History and Criticism and Miss Serjeantson of Philology. Sir Edmund Chambers, to whom *The Year's Work* is indebted for five years of attention to Shakespearean studies, has retired, and Professor Nicoll fills his place with his known competence. The book maintains its bulk, well-nigh thrice that of the modest proportions of the first year of its existence. Among the outstanding works of scholarship published in 1930 and discussed in this most helpful chronicle are Sir Edmund Chambers' *William Shakespeare*, Mr J. P. Oakden's *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English*, *The Records of the Court of Stationers* edited by

Dr Greg and Miss Boswell, Volumes VII, VIII and IX of the *Boswell Papers* edited by Professor Pottle, the first three volumes of the new Arden edition of Marlowe, Mr Meyerstein's *Life of Chatterton*, and Professor Rollins' further volumes of *Pepys Ballads*. I note that both in the Index and in Note 34, p. 279, Professor Bernbaum's publisher, Nelson, has supplanted him as author and has received the Christian names of Ernest Bernbaum.

C. J. S.

The first number of the new Oxford periodical, *Medium Ævum* (May, 1932, Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 80 pp. 6s.), sets us thinking about fashions in scholarship and academic practice. Some of us remember the time when a distinguished leader in the field of Romance philology contemptuously refused to offer a university course on mere modern French literature. To-day the pendulum is emphatically swinging in the opposite direction. With certain notable exceptions, the study of the older stages of our modern languages and literatures, no less than the study of the classics, has been steadily declining among the academic brotherhood and is in danger of being relegated to the background. 'Mediævalist,' in certain quarters at least, has come to be considered almost a term of reproach. Hence, any encouragement given to the cause of the minority is to be heartily welcomed. *Medium Ævum* makes its appearance as the organ of the recently founded Oxford Society for the Study of Mediæval Languages and Literature. It will be concerned with all matters touching 'the languages and literature of the Middle Ages'; 'history and antiquities,' we are told, 'will be treated in its pages only in so far as they illustrate an author or a text.' Its policy thus differs decidedly from that of *Speculum*, the organ of the Mediæval Academy of America, which is devoted to history in its widest sense, including, as it does, in its scope the entire civilisation of the Middle Ages, paying particular attention to mediæval Latin, and thus bringing out the element of essential unity characteristic of the period.

A distinct feature of this first number is the preponderance given to the Romance side; three of the five articles and all but one of the reviews are concerned with Italian, French, Spanish matters. Whether this is merely due to chance remains to be seen from succeeding issues. Another point noticed at once is the inclusion of several first-hand studies of MSS. preserved in English libraries.

B. H. Sumner, in a paper on Dante and the *regnum italicum*, skilfully combats the views set forth of late by Francesco Ercole. Two hitherto unnoticed Bodleian MSS. of the *Epistre d'Othea* of Christine de Pisan are commented upon by Kathleen Chesney. A comparison of the first and third versions of Froissart's Chronicles by F. S. Shears brings to light interesting examples of modernisation in the latter, especially in the matter of vocabulary. The English field is represented by two solid contributions. C. L. Wrenn, who discusses late Old English rune-names, follows up Hempel's much neglected paper on Hicckes's additions to the Runic Poem and points out that of the three supposed authorities for the late Old English fupark, MS. Domitian A. ix remains to us the only

primary source of information. The name *wen*, a Kenticism for *wyn*, was introduced (by Hickes) from this MS. into the Runic Poem; it was misapprehended by Kemble as *wēn* (= 'hope'). Attention is also called to MS. 17 of St John's College, Oxford, which contains the earliest MS. version of a later fupark now actually extant. Dorothy Everett shows (more fully than was done by Flugel years ago) that Furnivall's text of the Ellesmere MS., which is commonly relied upon by scholars, needs to be corrected in not a few instances. Her list of inaccuracies includes a number of important cases. There follow twenty pages of scholarly reviews. *Medium Ævum* is to appear three times a year. Members of the editorial board are: C. T. Onions (Editor), K. Chesney, A. Ewert, H. G. Fiedler, C. Foligno, J. Fraser, E. Vinaver. F. K.

Associating with Shakespeare, Mr Harley Granville-Barker's presidential address to the Shakespeare Association (London: H. Milford. 1932. 31 pp. 1s.) expresses admirably the sound views of a craftsman who is also a scholar upon the vexed question of modern production of Shakespeare. 'The first thing,' he writes (p. 27), 'is to find our way back,' but reproduction on the modern stage of the Elizabethan stage is not his conclusion. The problem runs far deeper and is incapable of a mechanical solution. What true scholarship can tell us of Shakespeare's dramatic art and of Elizabethan histrionic art will point the way. And Mr Granville-Barker has here and elsewhere made a valuable contribution to that requisite knowledge. C. J. S.

The Shakespere Allusion-Book, as re-edited by John Munro in 1909, and long out of print, is now re-issued by the Oxford University Press with a preface by Sir Edmund Chambers (London: H. Milford. 1932. 2 vols. 25s.). It is well that this indispensable book should once more be available, and at a reasonable price. Sir Edmund Chambers' preface indicates clearly how desirable it would be to have the book re-edited completely. New allusions have been found, and new light has been thrown on recorded allusions, by two more decades of research. It is certainly time, for instance, to remove the *Revels Books* from the list of spurious works and papers (II, p. 466). C. J. S.

Dr Benjamin Townley Spencer in his edition of Massinger's *The Bondman* (Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: H. Milford. 1932. 266 pp. 18s.) deserves the gratitude of students of the drama for producing a reliable text, for discovering a further source in the βιβλιοθήκη ιστορική, Books xxxiv and xxxvi, of Diodorus Siculus, and for an illuminating study of the classical ideals and contemporary political colouring permeating the play. It is a pity that Dr Spencer makes no attempt to discuss the copy for the 1624 quarto, for certain stage directions, notably 'a Chaire' (III, ii), suggest that the text was set up from a prompt copy. Why he notes 'And yet defe the Whip' (II, iii, 23) as corrupt is puzzling, since it is in perfect keeping with the context from II, iii, 12 onwards. The footnotes are inconvenient, there is no convention

of phrasing, the quartos are enumerated in any order, and the variant readings are not easily distinguishable. It is even more inconvenient to have no indication of act and scene division in the headlines. The textual notes are overburdened with quotations, allusions and explanations: it is strange to find "'to their teeth," defiantly, openly' (v, 1, 56) and "'heartstrings," figuratively used for the deepest affections' (v, 1, 30). The bibliography is incomplete. Lanfrancus' *Chirurgia Parva*, John Halle, 1565, mentioned in the note to v, ult., 34 is omitted. In the note to III, iii, 5 for 'Lording' read 'Ludowick.'

J. H. W.

The dissertation, *Of the Tribe of Homer*, by Willem van Doorn (Amsterdam: N. V. De Arbeiderspers. 1932. 249 pp. 4 fl. 90), described by its author as 'an enquiry into the theory and practice of English narrative verse since 1833,' resolves itself into a succession of analyses of narrative poems written during the past century. The first and most interesting chapter, which treats of J. S. Mill's theory of poetry as propounded in an article contributed to the *Monthly Repository* of 1833, would lead us to expect an enquiry into the causes that have occasioned the recent decline of narrative poetry with the growing predominance of lyric over epic impulse. But this hope is scarcely fulfilled in the ensuing chapters, which admit far too many side tracks. Thus, in a work ostensibly devoted to narrative poetry it is tiresome to find a whole chapter allotted to the writings of W. H. Hudson and advancing no theory strictly pertinent to the main matter in hand. The student of nineteenth-century poetry will doubtless find helpful comments and suggestions in Heer Van Doorn's examination of works by Horne, Morris, Doughty, Arnold, Clough, Swinburne, Tennyson, the Brownings and Masfield; but even here prose paraphrase too often does service as a substitute for criticism. The book shows evidence of sound scholarship and appreciative taste; but it savours too much of the research doctorate thesis and is not easy to read.

B. E. C. D.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

June—October, 1932

GENERAL.

- ANDERSON, A. R., *Alexander's Gate, Gog and Magog, and the Inclosed Nations* (Monographs of the Mediæval Academy of America, v). Cambridge, Mass., Mediæval Academy of America. \$3.
- BRINKLEY, R. F., *Arthurian Legend in the Seventeenth Century* (Johns Hopkins Monographs in Literary History, iii). Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 11s.
- GALINSKY, H., *Der Lucretia-Stoff in der Weltliteratur* (Sprache und Kultur der germ. und roman. Völker, iii). Breslau, Priebratsch. 8 M.
- GARDINER, A. H., *The Theory of Speech and Language*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d.
- Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages. 1.
- RUDWIN, M., *The Devil in Legend and Literature*. Chicago, Open Court Publ. Co. \$3.
- Todd Memorial Volumes: *Philological Studies*. Ed. by J. D. Fitz-Gerald and P. Taylor. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 62s. 6d.
- ZIPP, G. K., *Selected Studies of the Principle of Relation Frequency in Language*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Mediæval Latin.

- FRULOVISI, T. L., *Opera hactenus mēdita*. Ed. C. W. Previté-Orton. 2 vols. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 40s.
- MULLER, H. F., and P. TAYLOR, *A Chrestomathy of Vulgar Latin*. Boston, D. C. Heath. \$3.60.

Italian.

- BASILE, G. B., *The Pentamerone*, transl. from the Italian by N. M. Penzer. 2 vols. London, Lane. 42s.
- DANTE, ALIGHIERI, *Il Convivio*, riprodotto in fotografia. Introd. da F. Schneider. Vatican, Bibl. apostolica vaticana.
- DANTE ALIGHIERI, *La Vita Nuova*. Ed. critica da M. Barbi. Florence, Bemporad. L. 65.
- DEUTSCHES DANTE-JAHRBUCH. XIV. Herausg. von F. Schneider. Weimar, H. Bohlau. 14 M.
- HAUVETTE, H., *Les poésies lyriques de Pétrarque* (Les grands événements littéraires). Paris, E. Malfère. 12 fr.
- RITTER, H., *Silvio Pellico*. Zürich, Rascher. 4 M.
- SANCTIS, F. DE, *History of Italian Literature*. Transl. by J. Redfern. 2 vols. London, H. Milford. 42s.
- VISCARDI, A., *Saggio sulla letteratura religiosa del medio evo romanzo*. Padua, Cedam. L. 15.

Spanish.

- CARVAJAL, M. DE, *Tragedia Josephina*. Ed. by J. E. Gillet. (Elliott Monographs in the Romance Languages and Literatures, xxviii.) Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press \$2 50.
- HOLMES, H. A., *Spanish American in Song and Story*. New York, H. Holt \$2.75.
- PEERS, E. ALLISON, *St John of the Cross (Rede Lecture)* Cambridge, Univ. Press 2s 6d
- SPITZER, L., *Die Literarisierung des Lebens in Lopes Dorotea* (Kolner Romanische Arbeiten, iv). Bonn, Rohrscheid. 2 M. 80.
- VOSSLER, K., *Lope de Vega und sein Zeitalter*. Munich, C. H. Beck. 10 M.
- WILLE, J., *Calderóns Spiel der Erlösung*. Munich, Kaiser. 6 M.
- WRIGHT, L. O., *The -ra Verb Form in Spain* (Univ. of California Publ., xv, 1). Berkeley, Cal., Univ. of California Press. \$2.50.

French.*(a) General (including Linguistic).*

- BRUNOT, F., *Observations sur la Grammaire de l'Académie française*. Paris, Droz. 12 fr.

(b) Old French

- CHARLES D'ORLÉANS, *Chansons*, avec introduction et glossaire par V. Valkhoff. Rotterdam, Nijgh en van Ditmar. 10 fl.
- CHRÉTIEN DE TROYES, *Samtliche erhaltene Werke*. Herausg. von W. Foerster, v. Halle, M. Niemeyer 44 M.
- COHEN, G., *Chrétien de Troyes et son œuvre*. Paris, Boivin. 60 fr.
- Conte dou Bassil, *Le, poème du XIII^e siècle* par J. de la Chapelle de Blois. Ed. by R. C. Bates. (Yale Romanic Studies, iv.) New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 14s. 6d.
- DICK, F., *Bezeichnungen für Saiten- und Schlaginstrumente in der altfranzösischen Literatur* (Giessener Beitr. zur roman. Philologie, xxv). Giessen, Roman. Seminar. 4 M. 60.
- Haut Livre du Graal Perlesvaus, *Le*. Ed. by W. A. Nitze and T. A. Jenkins. 1. Texts, Variants and Glossary. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press; Cambridge, Univ. Press. 30s.

(c) Modern French.

- ALMÉRAS, H. D', *Le roman comique de Scarron (Les grands événements littéraires)*. Paris, E. Malfère. 9 fr.
- BOCQUET, L., *La littérature française de Belgique*. Paris, A. Messein. 15 fr.
- BOILEAU, RACINE, FURETIÈRE, etc. *Chapelain Décoiffé: a Battle of Parodies*. Ed. by G. L. van Roesebroeck. New York, Institute of French Studies. \$1.
- DABNEY, L. E., *Claude Billard* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages). Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8s.
- DARGAN, E. P., *H. de Balzac*. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press; Cambridge, Univ. Press. 5s. 6d.
- DESONAY, F., *Nouvelles notes autographes d'Antoine de la Salle*. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.
- DIDEROT, D., *Correspondance inédite*. Éd. par A. Gallimard. Paris. Gallimard. 90 fr.
- DIDEROT, D., *Lettres à Sophie Volland*. Éd. par A. Babelon. 3 vols. Paris, Gallimard. 135 fr.
- GRUBBS, H. A., *Damien Mitton (1618-90)* (Elliott Monographs in the Romance Languages and Literatures, xxix). Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press. 80 c.

- HARCOURT, B. D', *M. de Guérin et le poème en prose*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres. 25 fr.
- HILL, L. A., *The Tudors in French Dramas* (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures, xx). Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.
- JACOB, P. E., *Rémy de Gourmont*. Paris, Les Presses universitaires. 38 fr.
- KLEMPERER, V., *P. Corneille* (Epochen der französischen Literatur, iii, 1). Munich, Hueber. 5 M. 50.
- LANCASTER, H. C., *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the 17th Century*. II. 2 vols. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 55s. 6d.
- LAS VERGNAS, R., *Le Chevalier Rutledge, 1742-94* (Bibl. de la Revue de litt. comparée, lxxx1). Paris, H. Champion. 40 fr.
- MARTINEAU, H., *Stendhal et le salon de Mad. Ancelot*. Paris, Le Divan. 18 fr.
- MÉNARD, L., *Lettres inédites*. Publiées par H. Peyre. Paris, Les Presses universitaires.
- MOREAU, P., *Le classicisme des romantiques*. Paris, Plon. 36 fr.
- PERCEAU, L., *F. de Malherbe et ses escholiers*. Paris, J. Fort. 60 fr.
- PLATTARD, J., *F. Rabelais*. Paris, Boivin. 36 fr.
- POMMIER, J., *La Mystique de Baudelaire* (Publications de l'Univ. de Strasbourg). Paris, Les Belles Lettres. 18 fr.
- PROUST, M., *Correspondance générale*. III. Paris, Plon. 25 fr.
- SAINTE-BEUVE, C., *Les Maîtres de la Littérature Française; Portraits, Critiques et Extraits de Sainte-Beuve*. Ed. by J. J. Mayoux. London, G. Bell. 7s.
- SEDGWICK, H. D., *Alfred de Musset*. London, Eyre and Spottiswoode. 12s. 6d.
- SEILLÈRE, E., *Le romantisme et la morale; Le romantisme et la politique*. Paris, Nouv. Revue critique. Each 15 fr.
- TAVERA, F., *L'idée d'humanité dans Montaigne*. Paris, H. Champion. 50 fr.
- WILLNER, K., *Montchrestiens Tragödien und die storische Lebensweishheit* (Romanische Studien, xxxii). Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 8 M. 80.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

- HIRT, H., *Handbuch des Urgermanischen*. II. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, I, i, 21, 2.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 6 M.

Low German.

- DONELDEY, ARNOLDUS, *Das Bremer mittelniederdeutsche Arzneibuch des. Herausg. von E. Windler*. (Verein für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung, vii.) Neumünster, K. Wachholtz. 3 M.

Scandinavian.

- EKARD, E., *Sprache und Stil der 'Passio Olavi'*. Oslo, Dybwad. 4 kr.
- GELJER, E. G., *Impressions of England, 1809-10*. By A. Blanck. Transl. by E. Sprigge and C. Napier. (Anglo-Swedish Literary Foundation.) London, J. Cape. 7s. 6d.
- HEMMING-SJÖBERG, *A Poet's Tragedy: the Trial of C. J. L. Almqvist*. Transl. London, Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.
- JAKOBSEN, J., *An Etymological Dictionary of the Norn Language in Shetland*. II. London, D. Nutt. (Two vols.) £5 5s. 0d.
- KOCK, E. A., *Notationes Norrænæ. Anteckningar till Edda och Skaldediktning*. (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift.) 3 kr.

English.

(a) *General (including Linguistic).*

- ARONSTEIN, P., *Englandertum und englische Sprache* (Hefte zur Englandkunde, vi). Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 2 M. 50.
- Cambridge History of English Literature. Ed. by Sir A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. 15 vols. Reissue. Cambridge, Univ. Press. Each 5s.
- CHAMBERS, R. W., *On the Continuity of English Prose* (Reprinted from Harpsfield, *Life of More*, Early Eng. Text Society, 186). London, H. Milford. 6s.
- CRAIGIE, SIR W., *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*. II. (Assembling—Berising.) Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press; London, H. Milford. 21s.
- Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*. XVII. Ed. by W. H. Hadow. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.
- FUHRKEN, G. E., *Standard English Speech. A Compendium of English Phonetics for Foreign Students*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 5s.
- JOHNSON, E. L., *Latin Words of Common English*. New York, D. C. Heath; London, G. G. Harrap. 6s.
- JONES, D., *An Outline of English Phonetics*. 3rd ed. Cambridge, Heffer. 12s. 6d.
- KRUISINGA, E., *A Handbook of Present-day English*. II. *English Accidence and Syntax*. 3 vols. 5th ed. Groningen, P. Noordhoff. 6 fl. 50.
- SCHOFFLER, H., *Die politische Schulung des englischen Volkes* (Hefte zur Englandkunde, v). Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 1 M. 25.
- THORNTON, R. H., *An American Glossary*. III, 2. (Dialect Notes, vi, 4.) New Haven, Conn., American Dialect Society.
- WILLIAMS, C., *The English Poetic Mind*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.
- WYLD, H. C., *The Universal Dictionary of the English Language*. London, G. Routledge. 42s.
- Year's Work in English Studies*, The. XI, 1930. Ed. by F. S. Boas. London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

- BUHLER, C. F., *The Sources of the Court of Sapience* (Beitr. zur englischen Philologie, xxiii). Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 4 M.
- BYRNE, M., *The Tradition of the Nun in Mediæval England*. Washington, D.C., Catholic Univ. of America.
- CHAMBERS, R. W., *Beowulf: An Introduction to the Study of the Poem with a Discussion of the Stories of Offa and Finn*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 25s.
- DEKKER, A., *Some Facts concerning the Syntax of Malory's 'Morte Darthur'*. Amsterdam, M. J. Portielje.
- DEMPSTER, G., *Dramatic Irony in Chaucer* (Stanford Univ. Publications: Language and Literature, iv, 3). Stanford, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 9s.
- ERICSON, E. E., *The Use of Swa in Old English* (Hesperia, Erg.-Reihe, xii). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 4 M. 20.
- HEUER, H., *Studien zur syntaktischen und stilistischen Funktion des Adverbs bei Chaucer und im Rosenroman* (Anglistische Forschungen, lxxv). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 7 M. 50.
- HOLTHAUSEN, F., *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. I Lief. (Germanische Bibliothek, iv, 7.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M.
- HOOPS, J., *Beowulfstudien* (Anglistische Forschungen, lxxiv). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 7 M. 50.

- KOZIOL, H., Grundzuge der Syntax der mittelhenglischen Stabreimdichtungen (Wiener Beitr. zur englischen Philologie, lviii). Vienna, W. Braumuller. 8 M.
- LOVELICH, H., Merlin. Ed. by Dr E. A. Kock. III. (Early Engl. Text Society, 185.) London, H. Milford. 25s.
- RAY, B. K., Old English Morphology (Dacca University Bulletin, xvi). Dacca, University of Dacca.
- VAN OS, A. B., Religious Visions. The Development of the Eschatological Element in Mediæval English Religious Literature. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris.
- Vercell Book, The. Ed. by G. P. Krapp. (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, ii.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, Routledge. 18s.
- Vercelli-Homilies, Die. Herausg. von M. Forster. I. (Bibl. der angelsächsischen Prosa, xii.) Hamburg, Grand. 20 M.

(c) *Modern English.*

- BAUCKE, L., Die Erzählkunst in Thackeray's 'Vanity Fair' (Britannica, iv). Hamburg, Friedr. Schöner und De Gruyter. 8 M.
- BOS, K., Religious Creeds and Philosophies as represented by Characters in Sir Walter Scott's Works and Biography. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris. 4 fr. 50.
- BOSWELL, E., The Restoration Court Stage. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press, London, H. Milford. 25s.
- BRIDGES, R., Collected Essays. Papers, etc. VIII-X. London, H. Milford. 2s. 6d.
- BROCKINGTON, A. A., Browning and the 20th Century. London, H. Milford. 15s.
- CECIL, L. D., William Cowper (Engl. Ass. Pamphlets, 81). London, H. Milford. 2s.
- CHAPMAN, J. A., Wordsworth and Literary Criticism (Russell Lecture, 1931). London, H. Milford. 1s. 6d.
- Christmas Carols of the Sixteenth Century. Ed. by E. B. Reed. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 21s. 6d.
- COLERIDGE, S. T., Unpublished Letters. Ed. by E. L. Griggs. 2 vols. London, Constable. 37s. 6d.
- DEUTSCHBEIN, M., Neuenglische Stilistik. Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 4 M.
- DICKINSON, T. H., The Making of American Literature. London, Appleton. 12s. 6d.
- DORAN, M., The Text of King Lear (Stanford University Publications: Language and Literature, iv, 2). Stanford, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 9s. 6d.
- DRYDEN, J., Epilogue, March 19, 1681. Type-facsimile. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d.
- DU BOS, CH., Byron and the Need of Fatality. Transl. by E. C. Mayne. London, Putnam. 10s. 6d.
- Eighteen-Sixties, The. Ed. by J. Drinkwater. (Royal Soc. of Literature.) Cambridge, Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.
- ELWIN, M., Thackeray: a Personality. London, J. Cape. 12s. 6d.
- EVANS, A. W., Warburton and the Warburtonians. London, H. Milford. 15s.
- FRIEDERICH, W. P., Spiritualismus und Sensualismus in der englischen Barocklyrik (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, lvii). Vienna, W. Braumuller. 14 M.
- GASKELL, E. C., and C. E. NORTON, Letters (1855-65). Ed. by J. Whitehall. London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.
- GEROULD, G. H., The Ballad of Tradition. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.
- GOLDSMITH, O., The Grumbler. Ed. by A. I. P. Wood. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8s.
- GREENLAW, E., Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory (Johns Hopkins Monographs in Literary History, ii). Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 11s.

- HARPSFIELD, N., *The Life and Death of Sir Thomas Moore* Ed. by E. V. Hitchcock and R. W. Chambers. (Early Engl. Text Society, 186.) London, H. Milford. 36s
- HARRIES, F. J., *Shakespeare and the Scots*. Edinburgh, W. F. Henderson. 7s 6d.
- HUNT, V., *The Wife of Rossetti*. London, J. Lane 18s.
- HURD, R., and W. MASON, *Correspondence*. Ed. by the late E. H. Pearce and L. Whibley Cambridge, Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.
- JENKINS, E., *Lady Caroline Lamb*. London, Gollancz 10s. 6d.
- JOESTEN, M., *Die Philosophie Fieldings* (Kolner anglistische Arbeiten, xv). Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 5 M.
- JUNEMANN, W., *Drydens Fabeln und ihre Quellen* (Britannica, v). Hamburg, Friedrichsen und De Gruyter. 5 M.
- KLINKE, H., W. H. White (Mark Rutherford), *Versuch einer Biographie*. Greifswald. Dissertation. Frankfurt (Oder), W. Bohn.
- LA GORGE, A. DE, F. Thompson et les poètes catholiques d'Angleterre Paris, Plon. 15 fr.
- LAS VERGNAS, R., W. M. Thackeray: l'homme, le penseur, le romancier. Paris, H. Champion. 60 fr.
- LILJEGREN, S. B., *Harrington and the Jews*. Lund, Gleerup. 1 kr. 15.
- LOISEAU, J., A. Cowley. sa vie, son œuvre Paris, H. Didier.
- LOISEAU, J., A. Cowley's Reputation in England 2 vols. Paris, H. Didier.
- MARINOFF, I., *Neue Wertungen im englischen Roman*. Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz 8 M.
- MASSINGER, PH., *The Unnatural Combat*. Ed. by R. S. Telfer. (Princeton Studies in English, vii.) Princeton, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 18s.
- MILTON, J., *Paradise Regained*. Ed. by E. H. Blakeney London, Scholartis Press. 12s. 6d.
- MORISON, S., *The English Newspaper. Some Account of the Physical Developments of Journals printed in London between 1622 and the Present Day*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 45s.
- NEFF, E., *Carlyle*. London, Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.
- PHILLIPS, G., *The Tragic Story of 'Shakespeare' disclosed in the Sonnets, and the Life of Edward de Vere*. London, C. Palmer. 7s. 6d.
- QUILLER-BOUCH, SIR A., *Paternity in Shakespeare* (Brit. Academy. Annual Shakespeare Lecture). London, H. Milford 1s.
- RAND, B., *Berkeley's American Sojourn*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. \$2.
- RENZULLI, M., *La poesia di Shelley*. Rome, F. Campitelli. L. 20.
- ROMIEN, E. and G., *Life of George Eliot*. Transl. by B. W. Downs. London, J. Cape. 7s. 6d.
- RUBOW, P. V., *Shakespeare paa Dansk*. Copenhagen, Levin og Munksgaard. 5 kr. 50.
- Scott, Sir Walter, *To-day. Some Retrospective Essays and Studies*. Ed. by H. J. C. Grierson. London, Constable. 10s. 6d.
- SCOTT, SIR W., *Letters (1787-1807)*. Ed. by H. J. C. Grierson. London, Constable. 18s.
- SCOTT, SIR W., *Some Unpublished Letters*. Ed. by J. A. Symington. Oxford, Blackwell. 10s. 6d.
- Shakespeare Allusion-Book, The*. A Collection of Allusions to Shakespeare from 1591 to 1700. Compiled by C. M. Ingleby, L. Toulmin Smith, and F. J. Furnivall; re-edited by J. Munro; re-issued with a Preface by Sir Edmund Chambers. 2 vols. London, H. Milford. 25s.

- SMITH, E., *An Estimate of Wordsworth by his Contemporaries, 1793-1822*. Oxford, B. Blackwell. 18s.
- STEELE, SIR R., *The Christian Hero*. Ed. by R. Blanchard. London, H. Milford. 6s.
- SYMONS, A., *A Study of Walter Pater*. London, Sawyer. 12s. 6d.
- TENNYSON, A., LORD, *An Anthology*. Chosen by F. L. Lucas. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 5s.
- TILLYARD, E. M. W., *Milton: L'Allegro and Il Penseroso* (Engl. Ass. Pamphlets, 82). London, H. Milford. 2s.
- TOMPKINS, J. M. S., *The Popular Novel in England, 1770-1800*. London, Constable. 12s. 6d.
- VOGT, F., *Thomas Hardys Naturansicht in seiner Romanen* (Britannica, iii). Hamburg, Friedrichsen und De Gruyter. 6 M.
- WALLER, R. D., *The Rossetti Family, 1824-54* (Publications of the University of Manchester, English Series, xxi). Manchester, Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.
- WALRAF, E., *Soziale Lyrik in England, 1880-1914* (Beitr. zur engl. Philologie, xxiv). Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 5 M.
- WARD, A. C., *American Literature, 1880-1930*. London, Methuen. 7s. 6d.
- WEAVER, B., *Toward the Understanding of Shelley*. Ann Arbor, Univ. of Michigan Press. \$2.50.
- WEBER, A., *G. Gissing und die soziale Frage* (Beitr. zur engl. Philologie, xx). Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 15 M.
- WESSLAU, W., *Der Pessimismus bei D. H. Laurence*. Greifswald, H. Adler.
- WILLINSKY, M., *Bishop Percy's Bearbeitung der Volksballaden und Kunstgedichte seines Folio-Manuskriptes* (Beitr. zur englischen Philologie, xxii). Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 10 M.
- WILLIS, L. S., *Francis Lenton, Queen's Poet* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis). Philadelphia, Pa.
- WITHER, G., *The History of the Pestilence (1625)*. Ed. by J. M. French. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 13s.
- WOOD, ANTHONY A., *Life and Times*. Abridged from A. Clark's edition, with Introduction by L. Powys. London, Wishart. 15s.
- WRIGHT, S. F., *The Life of Sir W. Scott*. London, The Poetry League. 24s.

German.

(a) *General (including Linguistic)*.

- BEHAGHEL, O., *Deutsche Syntax*. iv. (Germanische Bibliothek, i, 1, 10, 4.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 12 M.
- MEINEL, H., *Vogtlandisch und Nordbayrisch* (Teuthonista, Beitr. v). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 7 M.

(b) *Old and Middle High German*.

- BRINKMANN, A., *Liturgische und volkstümliche Formen im geistlichen Spiel des deutschen Mittelalters* (Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung, iii). Munster, Aschendorff. 3 M. 35.
- Genesis, *Die altdeutsche*. Herausg. von V. Dollmayr. (Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, xxxi). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M. 20.
- GOFFING, F., *Der Renner Hugos von Trimberg* (Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung, i). Munster, Aschendorff. 4 M.
- KORN, K., *Studien über 'Freude und Tränen' bei mittelhochdeutschen Dichtern* (Von deutsche Poeterey, xi). Leipzig, G. J. Weber. 7 M. 60.
- LOWENSTEIN, H., *Wort und Ton bei Oswald von Wolkenstein* (Königsberger deutsche Forschungen, xi). Königsberg, Grafe und Unzer. 4 M. 50.

MAUSSER, O., *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik auf vergleichender Grundlage*. 2 vols. Munich, Hueber. 3 M. 75 and 6 M. 90.

QUINT, J., *Die Überlieferung der deutschen Predigten Meister Eckeharts*. Bonn, Rohrscheid. 31 M.

SAWICKI, S., *Gottfried von Strassburg und die Poetik des Mittelalters* (Germanische Studien, cxxiv). Berlin, Ebering. 7 M. 20.

Seifrits Alexander. *Aus der Strassburger Hs.* Herausg. von P. Gereke. (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, xxxvi.) Berlin, Weidmann. 14 M.

(c) *Modern German.*

BURKHARD, A., *Conrad Ferdinand Meyer: The Style and the Man*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 13s.

CASSIRER, E., *Goethe und die geschichtliche Welt. Drei Aufsätze*. Berlin, B. Cassirer. 2 M. 50.

ENDRES, F. C., *Symbolik von Goethes Faust*. Zurich, Rascher. 3 fr.

EWEN, F., *The Prestige of Schiller in England, 1788-1809*. New York, Columbia Univ. Press, London, H. Milford. 18s. 6d.

FRIEDLANDER, F., *Heine und Goethe* (Germanische und Deutsche, vii). Berlin, W. de Gruyter. 3 M.

Grillparzer-Gesellschaft, *Jahrbuch der*. Herausg. von K. Glossy. xxxi. Vienna, Perles. 3 M. 60.

HOFFMEISTER, J., *Goethe und der deutsche Idealismus*. Leipzig, Meiner. 7 M. 50.

JACOBSON, A., *Nachklänge R. Wagners im Roman* (Beitr. zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, xx). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 6 M.

KAHN, C., *Die Melancholie in der deutschen Lyrik der 18. Jahrh.* (Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, xxi). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 6 M.

KEHN, L., *Goethes Begriff der Bildung*. Hamburg, C. Boysen. 6 M.

Kleist-Gesellschaft, *Jahrbuch der*, xiii, xiv. Berlin, Weidmann. 10 M.

LEISEGANG, H., *Goethes Denken*. Leipzig, Meiner. 6 M. 75.

MÄDER, P., *Gotthelfs historische Novellistik und ihre Quellen* (Sprache und Dichtung, lii). Bern, Haupt. 5 fr.

NERVAL, G., *Les deux Faust de Goethe* (Œuvres complètes). Paris, Champion. 100 fr.

NEUENDORFF, O., *Georg Heseckiel* (Germanische Studien, cxxv). Berlin, Ebering. 7 M. 60.

PYRITZ, H., *P. Flemings deutsche Liebeslyrik* (Palaestra, clxxx). Leipzig, Mayer und Müller. 12 M.

ROETHE, G., *Goethe. Gesammelte Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Berlin, Ebering. 5 M.

SÄTTLER, G., *Das deutsche Lied in der französischen Romantik* (Sprache und Dichtung, li). Bern, Haupt. 6 fr.

SCHWERING, J., *F. W. Weber, der Arzt und Dichter*. Jena, Fischer. 6 M. 50.

SPINK, G. W., *F. Freiligraths Verbannungsjahre in London* (Germanische Studien, cxxvi). Berlin, E. Ebering. 4 M. 20.

SUARÈS, A., *Goethe, le grand Européen*. Paris, E. Paul. 12 fr.

WÄLZEL, O., *German Romanticism*. Transl. by A. E. Lussky. London, Putnam. 17s. 6d.

WEIDENKAMPT, I., *Traum und Wirklichkeit in der Romantik und bei Heine* (Palaestra, clxxxii). Leipzig, Mayer und Müller. 8 M.

WITTSACK, W., *Studien zur Sprechkultur der Goethezeit*. Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 6 M.

ZIEGLSCHMID, A. I. F., *Beiträge zur F. Hebbels Charakterkunde* (Hebbel-Forschungen, xxii). Berlin, Behr. 5 M.

THE LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE FOR THE DATE OF THE 'RUTHWELL CROSS'

THE data available for a determination of the date of the *Ruthwell Cross* are of two kinds: linguistic and non-linguistic. When attempts to determine it have been made there has always been a regrettable tendency to draw more conclusions, or at all events more precise conclusions, from the available evidence (both linguistic and non-linguistic) than is strictly legitimate. In this article I propose to examine those features of the language of the large inscription on the *Ruthwell Cross*¹ which are of value, or seem likely to be of value, as evidence for the date, and hence to ascertain precisely what conclusions as to the date can legitimately be drawn from this evidence². Incidentally some mention will be made of the vexed question whether the engraver of the inscription is presenting a true picture of the language actually spoken by him, or whether he is deliberately making use of forms which seem to him to be archaic.

A large number of the features of the language of the *Ruthwell Cross*, though interesting enough in themselves, do not bear upon the question of the date in any way and must therefore be considered as irrelevant in the present study. As examples we may mention: the absence of breaking in 'walde,' 'gālgu,' 'al³'; the representation of West Germ. *ā* by *ē* in 'per,' 'strelum⁴'; the representation of the *i*-umlaut of Pr. Germ. *au* by *ē* in '[b]istemi[d]⁵' and of that of Pr. Germ. *ō* by *æ* in 'gidræ[fi]d,' 'limwœrignæ⁶'; the vocalism of the first syllables of 'hælda⁷,' 'walde⁸.' All these features bear upon the question of the geographical position

¹ The texts of the Runic inscriptions and the system of transliteration of the O. E. Runic alphabet which are used here are those given by Bruce Dickins in *Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages*, I, pp. 15 ff., in the case of inscriptions not cited in that paper the texts have been taken from photographs kindly placed at my disposal by Professor Dickins. Note that I read 'giwundad' not 'giwundæd.' The reading with 'a' is found in many earlier editions of the text; see, for example, Hickes, *Grammaticae Islandicae Rudimenta* (1705), p. 4, Plate IV; Duncan, *Archeologia Scotica*, IV (1833), Plate XVII; Stephens, *The Ruthwell Cross, Northumbria* (1866), Plate to face p. 46. In 1929 Mr G. Turville-Petre and I confirmed this reading at Ruthwell.

² That this method of investigation will result in a new theory as to the date is not to be expected, for almost every conceivable date has already been suggested.

³ See Luick, *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, Par. 146.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, Par. 117.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, Par. 184.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, Par. 194.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, Par. 188, 1.

⁸ See Sievers, *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, Par. 428; van Helten, *Paul und Braunes Beitr.*, XXXV, p. 302.

occupied by the dialect of the *Ruthwell Cross*¹ but not at all upon the date of the inscription. In fact the only features of the language of the *Ruthwell Cross* which are relevant to the present discussion are those which are found in early O.E. texts but not in late ones, or, conversely, in late O.E. texts but not in early ones.

Before proceeding to the detailed treatment of the relevant features an important question of philological method must be discussed: in a short text (such as the *Ruthwell Cross*) it may happen that a number of forms and linguistic phenomena are evidenced once only. What guarantee have we that such forms or phenomena are normal for the text in question (as they are usually tacitly assumed to be) and not abnormal or erroneous? To take an example: on the *Ruthwell Cross* the forms 'hīæ,' 'hêafunæs' are found; from a consideration of the Northumbrian dialects (see below) it might possibly be suggested that we should rather expect the forms *hīa, *hêafnæs, what guarantee have we therefore that the forms 'hīæ,' 'hêafunæs' are not abnormal in the dialect of the *Ruthwell Cross*, or even erroneous? But to this methodological question it is unfortunately impossible to make a satisfactory answer; all that we can say is that, provided no definite evidence to the contrary is forthcoming, forms such as 'hīæ' and 'hêafunæs' must be considered to be normal².

An examination of the language of the *Ruthwell Cross* produces only eight features relevant to the present discussion:

I. The *e* in 'men.'

The nom. acc. pl. 'men' occurs twice on the *Ruthwell Cross*. In the earliest O.E. texts the *i*-umlaut of Pr. Germ. *a* before a nasal appears as *æ*, whereas by the time of the later texts it has become *e* except in a small area in the south-east³. Thus the *æ* is preserved in the oldest glossaries⁴ but in the *Vespasian Psalter*⁵ and early West Saxon⁶ *e* is the rule. In the proper names in the Moore MS. of Bede's *Historia Ecclesi-*

¹ The question does not concern us here and it will be sufficient to observe that the dialect of the *Ruthwell Cross* is, as we should expect, Northumbrian, and is probably very similar to that represented in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*; cf., in particular, *ea* for normal *eo* in 'hêafunæs,' 'fêarran' (see Luick, *op. cit.*, Pars. 127, 133 note 1, 228 note 2), and the pret. pl. ind. in *-u* (see below).

² When a form or linguistic phenomena is evidenced more than once in a short text the question is much simpler. Thus the form 'men' with a single *n* occurs twice on the *Ruthwell Cross*; if it were suggested that one would rather expect to find the form **menn* (see below), the mathematical theory of probability would tell us at once that the probability of the form 'men' being abnormal or erroneous is almost infinitesimal.

³ See Luick, *op. cit.*, Par. 186.

⁴ See Dieter, *Über Sprache und Mundart der ältesten englischen Denkmäler*, Par. 3 β.

⁵ See Zeuner, *Die Sprache des keltischen Psalters*, Par. 4, 1 b.

⁶ See Cosijn, *Altwestsächsische Grammatik*, Par. 12.

astica *e* is normal (e.g., *Hengist*, *Penda*); in the version of *Cædmon's Hymn* found in the same MS. the form *end* occurs and in the *Liber Vitae* we have *Dene-berct*, *Demma*; and *e* is the rule in the late Northumbrian texts¹.

Even making some allowance for the fact that the change of *æ* to *e* before a nasal may have taken place earlier in Northumbrian than in the dialect represented by the earliest glossaries, the occurrence of *e* and not *æ* in the form 'men' on the *Ruthwell Cross* shows that the date of the language represented in the inscription can hardly be referred to a period much earlier than that of the glossaries and the earliest Northumbrian texts.

II. The back-umlaut in 'hêafunæs.'

The form 'hêafunæs' shows the back-umlaut of *e*². In the earliest O.E. texts the back-umlaut of *e* is not yet evidenced. Thus in the *Epinal Glossary* *e* is the rule, although in the *Corpus Glossary* *eo* is found to a considerable extent³; in the proper names in the Moore MS. of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* the forms *Herut-eu*, *Herut-ford* occur, in the version of *Cædmon's Hymn* in the same MS. we have *metudæs* and even as late as the *Liber Vitae* a form apparently without back-umlaut is preserved in *Heru-uald* (beside *Eofor-hwæt*, *Eofor-uulf* with back-umlaut). In the later texts back-umlaut of *e* before a consonant, such as that in *heofon*, is found in all dialects⁴.

Even making some allowance for the fact that the back-umlaut of *e* may have taken place slightly earlier in some Northumbrian dialects than in others, the occurrence of *ea* and not *e* in the word 'hêafunæs' on the *Ruthwell Cross* shows that the date of the language represented in the inscription can hardly be referred to a period quite as early as that of the earliest Northumbrian texts.

III. The position with regard to the 'Vowel-shift.'

The development of the vowels in the unstressed syllables evidenced in the inscription on the *Ruthwell Cross* may be summarised as follows:

(1) Pr. E. *ā* or *o* appears as *a*; e.g., 'gistiġa,' 'hælda,' 'fêarran,' 'giwundad.'

¹ See Stolz, *Der Vokalismus der betonten Silben in der altnordhumbrischen Interlinearversion der Lindisfarner Evangelien*, Par. 51; Lindelof, *Die Sprache des Rituals von Durham*, p. 20, *Die sudnorthumbriische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts*, Par. 70.

² For the occurrence of *ea* instead of *eo* in 'hêafunæs,' 'fêarran,' see Luick, *op. cit.*, Pars. 133, 228 note 2.

³ See Dieter, *op. cit.*, Par. 7.

⁴ See Luick, *op. cit.*, Par. 228 a.

(2) Pr. E. *æ* remains in general; e.g., in 'geredæ,' 'hinæ,' etc., but in 'walde' it appears as *e*.

(3) Pr. E. *i* appears twice as *i*, in '[b]istemi[d]¹,' 'æppilæ,' and twice as *e*, in 'uŋket,' 'geredæ².'

(4) Pr. E. *u* remains; e.g., in 'alegdun,' etc.

From the first of these facts no conclusion as to the date can be drawn, for the change of Pr. E. *ā* or *o* to *a* appears to have been completed before the time of the earliest written documents³.

The second fact has, however, more bearing on the question. In the oldest O.E. texts *æ* is in general preserved, although even here a few forms with *e* are found. This is the position in the *Epinal Glossary*⁴, similarly in *Bede's Death-song* (in the St Gall MS.) *æ* is normal (e.g., in *gastæ*) but a few forms in *e* occur (e.g., *deothdæge*), and in *Cædmon's Hymn* we have *æ* in general (e.g., in *astelidæ*) but occasionally *e* (e.g., in *hrofe*). Even as late as the *Liber Vitæ* both *e* and *æ* are found. In all the later texts *e* is the rule⁵.

With respect to the change of Pr. E. *æ* to *e* in unstressed syllables therefore the language represented in the inscription on the *Ruthwell Cross* is in no way different to that of the earliest texts (e.g., *Bede's Death-song*, *Cædmon's Hymn* and the *Epinal Glossary*); hence the date can hardly be referred to a period much later than that of the *Liber Vitæ* (for then we should not expect so many forms in *æ*), nor to one much earlier than that of the earliest texts (for then we should not expect forms in *e*).

The third fact is equally important; *i* is preserved in such positions in the early charters of the South and Midlands⁶ and in the *Epinal Glossary*⁷; also in the early Northumbrian texts; thus in the proper names in the Moore MS. (e.g., *Aelli*), in *Cædmon's Hymn* (e.g., *maecti*) and in *Bede's Death-song* (e.g., *doemid*). In the *Liber Vitæ* *i* is in general preserved but some forms with *e* are also found⁸. In all the later texts *e* is the rule⁹.

The occurrence of forms in *i* and *e* (in approximately equal proportions) on the *Ruthwell Cross* shows that the date of the language represented in

¹ Confirmed by *bestemed*, *Dream of the Rood*, l. 48.

² The form '[m]odig' (confirmed by *modig*, *Dream of the Rood*, l. 41) is of no value in the present discussion, for we cannot ascertain whether the suffix *-ig* represents Pr. Germ. **-ag-* (cf. Goth. *modags*) or Pr. Germ. **-iz-* (cf. O.H.G. *muotig*). In the latter case we should have to assume that the vowel of the first syllable is due to analogy with a parallel form with Pr. Germ. **-ag-*, since it has not been affected by *i*-umlaut.

³ See Luick, *op. cit.*, Par. 323.

⁴ See Sievers, *Paul und Braunes Beistr.*, VIII, pp. 324 ff.

⁵ See Luick, *op. cit.*, Par. 324.

⁶ See Luick, *op. cit.*, Par. 325.

⁷ See Sievers, *loc. cit.*

⁸ See Muller, *Untersuchungen über die Namen des Nordhumbrischen Liber Vitæ*, p. 21.

⁹ See Luick, *loc. cit.*

the inscription can hardly be referred to a period quite as early as that of the early Northumbrian texts (for then we should not expect forms in *e*), nor to one much later than that of the *Liber Vitae* (for then we should not expect forms in *i*).

The fourth fact also has some bearing on the question of the date. In the later Northumbrian texts Pr. E. *u* appears normally as *o*¹ as it does in West Saxon². Since Pr. E. *u* is never represented by *o* on the *Ruthwell Cross*, the date of the language of the inscription can hardly be referred to a period as late as that of the late Northumbrian texts.

Finally there are three cases in which it appears at first sight that an unstressed vowel on the *Ruthwell Cross* cannot be justified etymologically:

A. 'bismærædu.' If we assign this form to a verb of the first weak conjugation³ we should expect either *i* (cf. '[b]istemi[d]') or *e* (cf. 'geredæ') in the penultimate syllable; if, as seems more probable⁴, to a verb of the second weak conjugation, either *a* (cf. 'gīwundad'), *o* or *u*⁵. The vowel *æ* is impossible etymologically⁶.

B. 'mip blodæ.' It is clear that this cannot be an old instrumental form, for such a form could only end in *-i* (as in the *Epinal Glossary*⁷), in *-u* (as in O.H.G. and O.S.), or it might be endless (by reason of the phonological loss of either *-i* or *-u* after a long syllable). If therefore we take the form 'blodæ' to be correct we must assume that here the dative has been used for the instrumental by a process similar to that evidenced in O.H.G. and O.S.⁸ It is unfortunately nearly impossible to decide whether such a process is really to be postulated for O.E. as well as for O.H.G. and O.S., for the great majority of O.E. texts are later than the vowel-shift and in such texts the dative (from Pr. E. *-æ*) and the instrumental (from Pr. E. *-i*) would have fallen together (under *-e*) for phonological reasons alone. Almost the only evidence which bears directly upon the case is the fact that in the *Epinal Glossary* the two cases are distinct.

¹ See Lea, *Anglia*, xvi, pp. 105 ff.; Fuchsel, *Anglia*, xxiv, pp. 39 ff.; Lindelof, *Die Sprache des Rituals von Dunham*, Par. 25; *Die sudnorthumbrische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts*, Par. 101.

² See Cosijn, *op cit.*, Par. 114.

³ Confirmed by *bysmeredon*, *Dream of the Rood*, l. 48.

⁴ See Bosworth and Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, s.v. *bysmerian*; cf. also O.H.G. *bismerôn*.

⁵ See van Helten, *Paul und Braunes Beitr.*, xv, pp. 463 ff.

⁶ In order to explain the *æ* as etymologically justified we should have to assume (1) that the verb in question originally belonged to the third conjugation of weak verbs; (2) that the form in question was a survival of a weak pretente proper to this conjugation similar to Goth. *habaida*. Two such assumptions, quite unsupported by any evidence, are clearly inadmissible.

⁷ See Sievers, *loc. cit.*

⁸ See Delbruck, *Synkretismus*, pp. 163 ff.

150 *Linguistic Evidence for the Date of the 'Ruthwell Cross'*

C. 'on rodi.' Since the noun *rōð* belongs to the *-ā*-declension it is clear that the form 'rodi' cannot represent any Pr. Germ. case-form directly. But as Sievers (*Paul und Braunes Beitr.*, VIII, p. 330) has pointed out, it seems possible that in some cases the ending *-i*, proper to the instrumental-locative of the *-o*-declension, may have been borrowed into the *-ā*-declension. This suggestion receives support from the form 'romæcæstri' on the *Franks Casket* and from at least one form in the *Epinal Glossary*¹.

A proper appreciation of the value of the forms 'bismærædu,' 'blodæ,' 'rodi' is very necessary for any consideration of the question whether the engraver of the inscription was deliberately using archaic forms or not. On the assumption that he was, the three forms in question can easily be explained as due to false etymology. For, if in the language actually spoken by the engraver the vowel-shift had already taken place, and if he was trying to represent in writing a state of the language in which it had not taken place (or had not been completed), he would be perfectly familiar with the fact that an unstressed *-e* in the language he was speaking might correspond to either an *-i* or an *-æ* in the language he was trying to write. Under these circumstances, although his sense of etymology might be sufficient to enable him to write the etymologically correct form in the majority of cases (as, for example, in '[b]istemi[d]' as compared to 'hinæ'), it is quite conceivable that in a few cases he should write *æ* when *i* would be correct or *vice versa*. On this assumption it is quite easy to understand that, if the engraver himself used the forms **blōde*, **rōde* he should have been led by false etymology to reconstruct the forms 'blodæ,' 'rodi' instead of the correct **blōdi*, **rōdæ*².

There remains the possibility of error; some or all of the forms 'bismærædu,' 'blodæ,' 'rodi' may be erroneous, and in this case they should be emended.

Reviewing the possibilities for each of the three forms under discussion the following conclusions may be reached:

A. 'bismærædu.' The vowel *æ* in the penultimate syllable cannot be justified etymologically, nor can it be due to false etymology on the part of the engraver. The form is therefore in all probability erroneous and should be emended. In view of the similarity of the runes 'æ' and 'a,' the emendation *'bismær[a]du' would seem to be the best, but *'bismær[o]du,'

¹ *maegsibbi* = 'affectui.'

² For the third form this explanation would not be so satisfactory. We should have to assume that the engraver himself used the form **bismærædu* (or **bismærædo*) and wrote 'bismærædu' instead of a correct **bismærædu*. This would in turn cause us to postulate a verb of the first weak class for whose existence there is insufficient evidence.

*'bismær[u]du' are also possible. The error may well be due to the presence of an 'æ' in the preceding syllable¹.

B. 'blodæ.' Here there are three possibilities: (a) the vowel æ may be etymologically correct, (b) it may be due to false etymology, and (c) the form may be erroneous and, in this case, it should be emended to *'blod[i].'

C. 'rodi.' Here also there are three possibilities: (a) the vowel i may be etymologically correct, (b) it may be due to false etymology, and (c) the form may be erroneous and, in this case, it should be emended to *'rod[æ].'

It seems impossible to decide which of these suggestions is the most probable. The only point, however, which is relevant² to the present discussion is the question whether the engraver was using archaic forms, and, in view of other possibilities, this is a question which for the present must perforce remain open.

IV. The absence of syncope in the form 'hêafunæs.'

In the form 'hêafunæs' the middle vowel has not been syncopated. In the late Northumbrian texts syncope of the middle vowel is the rule in this word³, whereas in the majority of O.E. texts⁴ it is not evidenced⁵.

The absence of syncope in the form 'hêafunæs' on the *Ruthwell Cross* shows that the date of the language of the inscription can hardly be referred to a period as late as that of the late Northumbrian texts.

V. The single consonants in 'men,' 'al.'

In the forms 'men' (twice), 'al' a single consonant is found in the final position when, from considerations of etymology, a double one would be expected. To explain this fact two suggestions may be put forward:

(1) The simplification may be due to a peculiarity of runic orthography,

¹ The origin of this 'æ' is itself a problem, but one which does not concern us here.

² For even on the assumption that the form 'blodæ' shows a later stage of development than that evidenced in the *Epinal Glossary* it would not be legitimate to infer that the date of the language represented in the inscription must be referred to a period later than that of the *Epinal Glossary*; it is quite possible that the process of syncretism may have taken place earlier in one dialect than in another.

³ See Cook, *A Glossary of the Old Northumbrian Gospels*, s.v.; Lindelof, *Wörterbuch zur Interlinearglosse des Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis*, s.v.; *Glossar zur altnorthumbrischen Evangelienübersetzung in der Rushworth-Handschrift*, s.v.

⁴ It happens that forms of this word which might show syncope are not recorded in the early Northumbrian texts.

⁵ The syncope of the middle vowel in words such as *heofon* has not yet been fully investigated (see Luick, *op. cit.*, Par. 334 ff.).

152 *Linguistic Evidence for the Date of the 'Ruthwell Cross'*

for in many O.E. runic inscriptions a similar usage¹ is evidenced. Thus on the third cross at *Thornhill* we find 'setæfte²'; on the *Urswick* cross-slab 3rd sing. pret. ind. 'setæ' and pl. imp. 'gebidæs'; on the *Lancaster* cross pl. imp. 'gibidæp'; on the stone at *Falstone* pl. imp. 'gebidæd' in runes, GEBIDÆD in Latin characters; cf. also 3rd sing. pret. ind. GISETAE in Latin characters on the *Yarm* cross-shaft

(2) The simplification may be phonological, for in many O.E. texts this type of simplification of final double consonants is evidenced. Thus in the *Vespasian Psalter*³ and in early West Saxon⁴. But in the late Northumbrian texts⁵ final double consonants are usually strictly preserved⁶.

If we accept the first of these suggestions we must conclude that the simplification of the double consonants in the forms 'men,' 'al' on the *Ruthwell Cross* has no bearing on the question of the date; if we accept the second, we must conclude that the date of the language of the inscription must be referred to a period later than that of the late Northumbrian texts. The question of which is the more probable of these two suggestions is one which, for the present⁷, must perforce remain open.

VI. The position with regard to the loss of final *n*⁸.

The forms on the *Ruthwell Cross* which call for discussion in this connexion are:

- (1) inf. 'gistiġa,' 'hælda.'
- (2) acc. sing. 'ġalġu.'
- (3) pl. pret. ind. 'bismærædu,' 'kwomu'; 'alegdun,' 'gistoddun.'
- (4) 'fêarran,' adv.

In the infinitive *n* is preserved in *Cædmon's Hymn* (*hergan*), whereas in the *Leiden Riddle* (*cnyssa*), as in the late texts⁹, it is normally lost. In the oblique cases of the weak declension of nouns *n* has been lost after

¹ For the corresponding orthographic doubling of consonants in runic inscriptions see pp. 153-4.

² I.e. *settæ æfter.

³ See Zeuner, *op. cit.*, Par. 44, 3.

⁴ See Cosijn, *op. cit.*, Par. 130 ff.

⁵ Only the larger texts can afford us any evidence in this connexion; thus from the form *Cyni-bill* in the Moore MS. we cannot be certain that all final double consonants were preserved in this dialect.

⁶ See Lea, *Angha*, xvi, p. 133; Fuchsel, *Angha*, xxiv, p. 57; Foley, *The Language of the Northumbrian Gloss to the Gospel of Matthew*, Par. 45-6. For the condition of *Rushworth 2* see Lindelof, *Die sudnorthumbrische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts*, Par. 139.

⁷ See p. 155, n. 3.

⁸ This is one of the chief characteristics of the Northern dialect of O.E.; see Girvan, *Angelsaksisch Handboek*, Par. 254, 2c. It should be observed that the reason why *n* was lost in some forms but not in others is at present unknown.

⁹ See Kolbe, *Die Konjugation der Lindisfarner Evangelien*, Par. 205; Lindelof, *Die Sprache des Rituals von Durham*, p. 82; *Die sudnorthumbrische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts*, pp. 130, 139, 146.

*u*¹ in *foldu* in *Cædmon's Hymn*, and in the late texts forms without *n* normally appear in all the oblique cases². In the pl. pret. ind. *n* is preserved in all texts³ with the exception of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* where, although *-on* is the normal ending, a number of forms in *-o* are also found⁴. But we have no evidence that these forms in *-o* are due to a later loss of *n* than that evidenced, for example, in the acc. sing. of the weak declension; it is quite possible that the loss of *n* in the pl. pret. ind. may have taken place in one Northumbrian dialect but not in another. The fact that forms of the pl. pret. ind. without final *n* are found on the *Ruthwell Cross* does not entitle us to conclude therefore that the date of the inscription must necessarily be referred to a late period. In fact the only conclusion which can legitimately be drawn from these first three facts with regard to the loss of final *n* is that the date cannot be referred to a period much earlier than that of the early Northumbrian texts, for in this case we should not expect to find any loss of final *n* whatsoever.

Of words such as 'fæarran' we have an example in *ouana* (= *āhwonan*) in the *Leiden Riddle*; in the late texts, although exceptions occur, it is safe to say that forms without *n* are normal⁵. But the occurrence of the form 'fæarran' on the *Ruthwell Cross* has no bearing on the question of the date, for there is always the possibility that the preservation of the *n* may be due to analogy with O.E. *feorrane*⁶, and this analogy may have taken place at any period.

VII. The double consonants in 'æppilæ,' 'gistoddu,' and 'almeztig.'

In the forms 'æppilæ,' 'gistoddu' and 'almeztig' a double consonant is found, when, from considerations of etymology, a single one would be expected. Doubling of etymologically single consonants is a characteristic of late Northumbrian⁷, and it might therefore appear at first

¹ It appears that in the oblique cases of the weak declension final *n* was lost at an earlier period after *u* than after *a*, thus in *Cædmon's Hymn* we have *foldu* as compared to *uullan*, *egsan* in the *Leiden Riddle* and *Pendan*, *Eollan* in the Moore MS. For an explanation of the final vowel in accusative singulars such as *foldu*, 'galgu' see van Helten, *Paul und Braunes Beitr.*, xv, p. 461; xxi, p. 462; xxxvi, p. 480.

² See Carpenter, *Die Deklination in der nordhumbrischen Evangelienübersetzung der Lindisfarner Handschrift*, Par. 416; Lindelof, *Die Sprache des Rituals von Durham*, Pars. 59, 63, *Die sudnorthumbrische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts*, pp. 114 ff.

³ Thus in *aeofun* in the *Leiden Riddle* (cf. *scylun* in *Cædmon's Hymn*), and see also Lindelof, *Die Sprache des Rituals von Durham*, Par. 47; *Die sudnorthumbrische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts*, pp. 130, 139, 147.

⁴ See Kolbe, *op. cit.*, Par. 211.

⁵ See Carpenter, *op. cit.*, Par. 598; Lindelof, *Die sudnorthumbrische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts*, p. 87.

⁶ For the relation between O.E. *feorran* and *feorrane* see van Helten, *Paul und Braunes Beitr.*, xxviii, pp. 559 ff.

⁷ This late Northumbrian doubling has been investigated in considerable detail by Luick, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, cii, pp. 58 ff.

sight that the occurrence of double consonants for etymologically single ones enabled us to conclude that the date of the language represented in the inscription should be referred to a period as late as that of the late Northumbrian texts. But a closer examination of the three examples shows that the doubling evidenced on the *Ruthwell Cross* only resembles that found in the late Northumbrian texts quite superficially. Thus a doubling of *p* such as that in 'æppilæ' or of *t* such as that in 'almeztig' would be entirely exceptional in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* or in *Rushworth 2*.

It seems probable that the double consonants in these words on the *Ruthwell Cross* are not due to any phonological change such as that found in late Northumbrian, but rather to a mere habit of runic orthography. For an apparently haphazard doubling of etymologically single consonants is frequently evidenced in O.E. runic inscriptions. Thus on the *Ruthwell Cross* itself we find the Latin word 'dominnæ' (in one of the minor inscriptions) and on the *Bewcastle Column*, 'gessus kristtus'; similarly on the third cross at Thornhill we find dat. sing. 'êategune' (i.e., *Ēad-ġegne*) and on one of the *Hartlepool* grave-slabs 'hilddigyp.'

The occurrence of double consonants in the forms 'æppilæ,' 'gistod-dun' and 'almeztig' on the *Ruthwell Cross* has therefore no bearing on the question of the date.

VIII. The form 'hiæ.'

In the late Northumbrian texts the normal form of the nom. acc. pl. of the pronoun of the third person is *hia*¹; it seems probable that the earlier *hie* (< *hiæ* < Pr. Germ. **χi-ai*), preserved in other O.E. dialects (for example in West Saxon) has become *hia* in Northumbrian by analogy with the nom. acc. pl. of the definite article, *ðā*. The occurrence of the form 'hiæ' (= West Saxon *hie*) on the *Ruthwell Cross* shows therefore that the date of the language of the inscription should be referred to a period prior to the operation of this analogical change, i.e., to one earlier than that of the late Northumbrian texts.

CONCLUSIONS.

A. The question of deliberate archaism.

There is unfortunately not sufficient evidence to enable us to decide whether the engraver of the inscription was representing the language he actually spoke or whether he was deliberately making use of forms which

¹ See Cook, *op. cit.*; Lindelöf, *Wörterbuch zur Interlinearglosse des Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis*; Glossar zur altnorthumbrischen Evangelienübersetzung in der *Rushworth-Handschrift*, s.v. *he*.

seemed to him archaic, for the forms 'blodæ,' 'rodi' can be explained without the assumption of false etymology. Under these circumstances it seems reasonable to adopt the conventional procedure and assume that the engraver was giving a true picture of the language he actually spoke, until this assumption is discredited by the production of further evidence¹.

B. The question of the date.

In view of the occurrence of the *e* in 'men' (No. I), the back-umlaut of *e* in 'hêafunæs' (No. II) and the condition with regard to the vowel-shift (No. III) we cannot refer the date of the language of the inscription on the *Ruthwell Cross* to a period quite as early as that of the early Northumbrian texts². On the other hand, in view of the condition with regard to the vowel-shift (No. III), the absence of syncope in the form 'hêafunæs' (No. IV) and the occurrence of the form 'hiæ' (No. VIII), we cannot refer the date to a period as late as that of the late Northumbrian texts³. It follows therefore that all that can be concluded from the linguistic evidence is that the date of the language of the inscription must be referred to a period very slightly later than that of the early Northumbrian texts.

ALAN S. C. ROSS.

LEEDS.

¹ Should such evidence ever be forthcoming we shall have to distinguish two dates: (1) the date at which the inscription was actually engraved and (2) the date represented by the language of the inscription. It is the latter that is discussed in the present study.

² And this conclusion does not conflict with that to be inferred from the condition with regard to the loss of final *n* (No. VI).]

³ Under these circumstances it follows that the second of the two alternative suggestions put forward to explain the single consonant in 'men,' 'al' (No. V) must be rejected, for, if we were to accept it, we should be forced to conclude that the date had to be referred to a period later than that of the late Northumbrian texts, a conclusion at variance with the others. The first suggestion—that the simplification is merely due to a habit of runic orthography and has therefore no bearing on the question of the date—is the only possible one.

THE SOURCES OF CHRISTINA ROSSETTI'S 'GOBLIN MARKET'

Goblin Market and other Poems (1862) by Christina Rossetti is a volume of importance in the history of later Victorian romanticism, for it was here that the poetry of the Pre-Raphaelites and their associates first gained any considerable attention. Dante Gabriel Rossetti's work, apart from his translations *The Early Italian Poets*, 1861, had seen obscure periodical publication in *The Germ* (1850), and in 1854 in *The Dusseldorf Album*¹ and elsewhere, but his gesture of throwing the manuscript of his poems into his wife's coffin delayed the publication of his original poems until 1870. Swinburne's *Queen Mother* and *Rosamond* (1860) had passed unnoticed, except for a few condemnatory reviews, while even William Morris's *The Defence of Guenevere* (1858) failed to awaken the critical consciousness to the new poetry that was developing. Christina Rossetti's volume of 1862 attracted immediate notice and it has continued to obtain wide recognition. Yet the title poem, *Goblin Market*, though admittedly the most original of Christina's compositions, remains one of the most unexplored poems in the period. The same problems are raised as by *The Ancient Mariner*; a theme and movement, suggesting many things and not assignable to one source, a concluding moral acting as an anticlimax to the glamour and magic which precede it. Further, *Goblin Market* differs as widely from Christina Rossetti's later work as *The Ancient Mariner* does from Coleridge's later compositions. Whatever impulses and intuitions she gathered into this poem were never to be handled by her in such a manner again.

No attempt has been made to isolate the sources or experiences from which this poem arose. W. M. Rossetti, the pedestrian Boswell of the Pre-Raphaelites, in his various memoirs of the Rossetti family, and equally Christina and Dante Gabriel Rossetti in their letters, refer to the poem itself but never to the way in which it came into being. Critical literature following this tradition has praised the poem without exploring its origins. Dr Oliver Elton was summarising this view when he described *Goblin Market*: 'a fairy tale.... It is pure invention, and not of the popular stock².' Christina Rossetti's latest biographer makes the same implication when she describes the poem as 'an act of pure imaginative

¹ See *Festschrift des Leipziger Bibliophilien-Abends*, Leipzig, 1929.

² *A Survey of English Literature* (1830-80), London, 1920, II, p. 23.

creation¹. While much in the poem may arise from suggestions too personal to unravel, I believe that certain features become clearly visible when they are studied in relationship to books that Christina Rossetti is known to have read, and experiences through which she is known to have passed.

Among the books read by Christina Rossetti and the other Rossetti children was *The Fairy Mythology* of Thomas Keightley². The author was a friend of the household and the book was a favourite with the children³. In his sometimes inaccurate but genially entertaining volumes Keightley has gathered fairy stories of many countries of dwarfs, elves, nisses and goblins. None of these stories contains the plot of *Goblin Market*, for Christina Rossetti's invention is obviously not based on simple derivation from one source. The whole *décor* of *Goblin Market* is, however, already present in Keightley. The volumes have numerous illustrations in which dwarfs and goblins are portrayed, in very much the same way as they are portrayed in Dante Gabriel Rossetti's second illustration to Christina Rossetti's poem. Out of this general similarity there emerges one passage which may hold within it the *idée génératrice* of *Goblin Market*. In his section on Great Britain, Keightley gathered together all the references to fairies in Shakespeare's plays. He found in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* his richest source, and among the passages which he extracted is the following⁴: 'And when enamoured of Bottom, she [Titania] directs her Elves that they should

Hop in his walks, and gambol in his eyes,
Feed him with apricocks, and dewberries,
With purple grapes, green figs, and mulberries.'

This passage is charmingly illustrated with an etching of the 'little men' who are bearing the tempting fruit to Bottom. It will be remembered that in Christina Rossetti's poem the main motive is of two sisters, Laura and Lizzie, who are tempted by the fruit proffered by goblin men, and among the fruit which they offer are

Swart-headed mulberries.
Wild free-born cranberries,
Crab-apples, dewberries,
Pine-apples, blackberries,
Apricots, strawberries;—
All ripe together.

¹ D. M. Stuart, *Christina Rossetti*, London, 1930.

² *The Fairy Mythology*, 2 vols., London, 1828, with wood and copper-plate etchings by W. H. Brooke, F.S.A.

³ W. M. Rossetti, *Family Letters with a Memoir*, London, 1895, I, pp. 44 and 60.

⁴ From *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act III, Sc. i. Titania's instruction to Peaseblossom, Cobweb, Moth and Mustardseed. Keightley, II, p. 131.

Thus in Keightley she could find the motive of the proffering of fruit by 'little men,' and the similarity can be more fully appreciated once the etching in Keightley has been seen.

While childhood recollections of Keightley's fairies had prepared the background for the poem, something had been necessary to quicken those early recollections in 1859 when she wrote the poem. It is possible that in the poem *The Faeries* of William Allingham she found that stimulus which recalled her own earlier encounters in Keightley. Apart from the contact of theme there exists in Allingham's trochaic movement some similarity with the prosody of parts of *Goblin Market*:

Up the airy mountain,
Down the rushy glen,
We daren't go a-hunting
For fear of little men;
Wee folk, good folk,
Trooping all together,
Green jacket, red cap,
And white owl's feather!
* * * * *
They stole little Bridget
For seven years long;
When she came down again
All her friends were gone.
They took her lightly back,
Between the night and morrow,
They thought that she was fast asleep,
But she was dead with sorrow¹.

That both Christina and Dante Gabriel Rossetti knew Allingham is well established², and they were both admirers of his work.

Allingham, however, can have only brought back to her consciousness memories which she had long possessed in which the motive of temptation was closely linked with the proffering of rich fruits. The image had existed early within her memory and the elements of it which she gathered from Keightley had become associated with other modifying features. As early as 1847 she had written a poem entitled *The Dead City*, which obviously owes its origin to the story of Zobeide³ in *The Arabian Nights*. Zobeide describes in *The Arabian Nights* how she passed through a city full of people, motionless and petrified, standing as if they were statues, until she came finally to a palace of great magnificence, where she found a young man who could tell her the secret of this mystery. Christina

¹ Allingham's lyric was written by January 8, 1849. See *W. Allingham, A Diary*, ed. H. Allingham and D. Radford, London, 1907, p. 45.

² *Ibid.*

³ In *The Story of the three Calendars, Sons of Sultans and the Five Ladies of Bagdad*. The fruit passages in *The Dead City* were associated with *Goblin Market* by Edmund Gosse in *Critical Kit-Kats*, London, 1896, p. 142.

Rossetti in *The Dead City* used this background: she has a city, and petrified people and a palace, but she omits the young man and substitutes an elaborate description of a banquet with the suggestion that it was for 'luxury and pride' that the city had suffered. In describing the banquet she returns to the motive of the tempting fruits found in Keightley and she unites this with an *Arabian Nights* setting:

All the vessels were of gold,
Set with gems of worth untold.
 In the midst a fountain rose
 Of pure milk, whose rippling flows
In a silver bason rolled.
In green emerald baskets were
Sun-red apples, streaked and fair;
 Here the nectarine and peach
 And ripe plum lay, and on each
The bloom rested everywhere.
Grapes were hanging overhead,
Purple, pale, and ruby-red;
 And in panniers all around
 Yellow melons shone, fresh found,
With the dew upon them spread.
And the apricot and pear
And the pulpy fig were there,
 Cherries and dark mulberries,
 Bunchy currants, strawberries,
And the lemon wan and fair.

This union of detail derived from Keightley with an *Arabian Nights* motive has left a definite mark on *Goblin Market*. There it is emphasised that the 'little men' bear their fruit on vessels of gold:

One hauls a basket,
One bears a plate,
One lugs a golden dish
Of many pounds' weight.

And later:

One heaved the golden weight
Of dish and fruit to offer her.

Nothing in Keightley's stories of goblins would suggest such splendour, but the story of Zobeide was decked in gold and luxuries:

All the vessels were of gold,
Set with gems of worth untold.

Already in *The Dead City*, the Keightley passage had coalesced with *Arabian Nights* memories and the same union of recollections reappears in *Goblin Market*. Nor need it be assumed that the sources of suggestion were confined to the passages which have been quoted. It is in them that verbal resemblance is closest, but Keightley had a number of incidents in

which fairy people proffer food to mortals. Only a few pages away from the extracts from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* Christina Rossetti could have read the following extract from Bovet's *Pandemonium*: 'Reading once the eighteenth of Mr Glanvil's relations, p. 203, concerning an Irishman that had like to have been carried away by spirits, *and of the banquet they had spread before him in the fields*¹.' It is in the same section in Keightley that she might have read: 'Such jocund and facetious spirits . are said to sport themselves in the night by tumbling and fooling with servants and shepherds in country houses, pinching them black and blue, and leaving bread, butter, and cheese sometimes with them, which, if they refuse to eat, some mischief shall undoubtedly befall them by means of these Faeries².' Yet despite the comparative frequency of such passages in Keightley, none has the verbal identity of the extract from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and none has *The Arabian Nights* elements present in *The Dead City* and reintroduced into *Goblin Market*.

It would appear then that the central motive in *Goblin Market* arose from the coalescing of two memories of childhood reading. Apart, however, from *The Arabian Nights* suggestions, Christina's goblins differ in other ways from all of Keightley's many figures. In Christina Rossetti they are described as merchant men, and they sell their dread fruits just as any hawker in the London streets might traffic his wares. Further, in exactly the same way as the London street-sellers the goblin men had their cry:

Come buy our orchard fruits,
Come buy, come buy.

How came it that this pedlar feature came attached to figures that arose from memories of Titania and of *The Arabian Nights*? One explanation may lie in Christina Rossetti's own childhood experience. The Rossetti house at No. 38 Charlotte Street was in a road that was of decreasing respectability and the children were warned against too close contact with the undesirable members of neighbouring families³. Further, all biographical evidence would indicate that the virtuous sister in the poem had a parallel in real life with Christina's own elder sister, Maria. There is ample material to show that Christina was an impetuous, wilful child and that Maria attempted to discipline her impulses⁴. Thus the *Goblin Market* situation of two sisters with an influence against which they were

¹ Keightley, II, p. 113 (the italics are mine).

² Keightley, II, p. 109.

³ See R. D. Waller, *The Rossetti Family*, Manchester, 1932; I am indebted to Mr Waller for a number of suggestions in this article.

⁴ *Family Letters*, ed. W. M. Rossetti, London, 1908.

warned and with one sister attempting to check the unruliness of the other is present in the pattern of Christina's life at Charlotte Street. But this still leaves unsolved the transformation of the goblins into pedlars. Christina must have heard as a child the cries of the London street pedlars as she sat by the window of the Charlotte Street house and looked into the street where she was forbidden to play. The memories of London street cries had over a century before cheered Dean Swift and led him to write imitative pieces, which show how closely the *Goblin Market* movement is to the jingle of the street pedlar:

Come buy my fine wares,
Plums, apples, and pears.
A hundred a penny,
In conscience too many:
Come, will you have any?¹

But Christina's interest in the street-sellers does not rest entirely on speculation. One knows that within the Rossettis' house there were a number of volumes, favourites of all the children, which collected a large number of pedlars' cries within their pages: these were Hone's *Every-Day Book* and possibly *The Table Book* and *The Year Book*². The full influence of these delightful miscellanies on Victorian poetry has yet to be traced. They certainly gave Tennyson the story of St Simeon Stylites, and they furnished a number of suggestions for both Dante Gabriel and Christina. No one can have read them (and it must be remembered that the Rossetti children were frequently turning their pages) without realising the interest that Hone took in London street cries. When Christina turned to Hone's *Every-Day Book* for August 25, 1827, she would read:

My pity is reserved for their forlorn little brethren, doomed to breathe the unwholesome atmosphere of crowded manufactories, and close narrow alleys in populous cities! What a luxury would a supper be twice a week, for instance, to the poor little 'bottoms' in Spitalfields. Who knows but they might receive their first taste for Shakespeare while being fed, like their great prototype in the 'Mid Summer Night's Dream' with blackberries! 'Dewberries,' which Titania ordered for the refreshment of her favourite, are so nearly allied to their glossy neighbours, that when the season is far advanced the two are not easily distinguished. Shakespeare, who knew everything, was of course aware that the dewberry ripens earlier than the blackberry; namely, in the season for 'apricots.'...I own I am sanguine respecting the general introduction of blackberries into the London street cries. What an innovation they would cause! What a rural sight, and sound, and taste would they introduce into that wilderness of houses! What a conjuring up of happy feelings—almost as romantic as those that are inspired by 'bilberries, ho³!'

¹ *Verses Made for Fruit-Women*, quoted from *The Poems of Jonathan Swift*, ed. by W. E. Browning, London, 1910, I, p. 285.

² William Hone, *The Every-Day Book or Everlasting Calendar*, 2 vols., London, 1827, 1829, William Hone, *The Table Book*, London, 1827; William Hone, *The Year Book*, London, 1832. See W. M. Rossetti, *Memoir etc. of D. G. Rossetti*, I, p. 82. W. M. Rossetti mentions the *Every-Day Book*, but as *The Table Book* and *The Year Book* are in the same series, I have thought it probable that the Rossetti children would have seen these as well.

³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 559.

162 *The Sources of Christina Rossetti's 'Goblin Market'*

Here was the very passage from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* which Keightley had quoted, allied now to the London street cries and reset amid the 'wilderness of houses' which Christina was always to know better than country scenes. While I regard this as the crucial passage which telescopes with her other memories, Christina could have found many other references to street cries as she turned the pages of Hone. In *The Table Book* she would have found an illustrated article on *London Cries*¹ and with others the cry of the negro-man, 'balloon lemons, quality oranges, quality lemons, holiday limes,' and later in the same volume² she could have found another illustrated collection of miscellaneous cries. In *The Every-Day Book* for July 4, 1826, she could have found an illustrated article on *The London Barrow Woman*³, and her cries,

Round and sound
Two-pence a pound
Cherries! rare ripe cherries!

and later,

Cherries a ha'penny a stick!
Come and pick! come and pick
Cherries! big as plums!
Who comes? Who comes?

Yet even if she did not encounter these and other references, she can scarcely have missed the first entries in *The Every-Day Book* for 1826. Here in a delightful article Hone records the New Year gifts given to Queen Elizabeth including a 'box of cherries and one of apricots' and continues⁴: 'Some of these gifts to Elizabeth recall to recollection the tempting articles which Autolycus in the "Winter's Tale," invites the country girls to buy: he enters singing

Lawn as white as driven snow.'

Hone gives the whole of Autolycus's song to the words:

What maids lack from head to heel,
Come, buy of me, come: come buy, come buy;
Buy, lads, or else your lassies cry,
Come buy.

Here with the very words which she introduces into the first lines of her poem she finds again the motive of 'tempting articles' inviting 'the country girls to buy.'

To attempt to trace the influence of Hone on incidental passages of *Goblin Market* would lead to digression from my attempt to see how the

¹ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 255, 256.

³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 452.

² *Loc. cit.*, p. 630.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*, p. 4.

main motives of the poem arose in Christina Rossetti's mind. Further I am aware that caution must be used in estimating Hone's influence as a source. His volumes are so miscellaneous, and contain so many references that it is inevitable that there should be many contacts between *Goblin Market* and Hone of which Christina Rossetti need not herself have been aware. It is one thing to affirm the memory of the street cries which are such a persistently reiterated feature in Hone and quite another to identify a single passage in Hone with a single incident in the poem. Yet with this caution in mind, one is still impressed by the way in which poems and extracts in Hone coincide with passages in the poem. I will digress to quote only one instance. In *Goblin Market* Lizzie reminds her sister of the tragedy which befell Jeanie who succumbed to the temptation of the goblin men:

She pined and pined away;
Sought them by night and day,
Found them no more, but dwindled and grew grey;
Then fell the first snow,
While to this day no grass will grow
Where she lies low:
I planted daisies there a year ago
That never blow.

The whole incident seems to be the recollection of some ballad theme which I have been unable to identify, but the fate of Jeanie and of her grave resembles the poem 'The young maid stole from her cottage door,' given in Hone's *Every-Day Book* (1826)¹. The theme is of the maiden who gathered St John's wort:

With noiseless tread
To her chamber she sped,
Where the spectral moon her white beams shed—
'Bloom here—bloom here, thou plant of pow'r,
To deck the young bride in her bridal hour!'
But it dropped its head the plant of power,
And died the mute death of the voiceless flower.
And a withered wreath on the ground it lay,
More meet for a burial than bridal day.
And when a year was past away,
All pale on her bier the young maid lay.
And the glow-worm came
With its silvery flame,
And sparkled and shone
Thro' the night of St. John,
And they closed the cold grave o'er the maid's cold clay.

To return from this digression to the dominant features of *Goblin Market*, one notices that the goblin men, despite their *Midsummer*

¹ *Loc cit*, p 427.

164 *The Sources of Christina Rossetti's 'Goblin Market'*

* *Night's Dream* fruits, and their *Arabian Nights* vessels of gold and their London street hawkers' cries, are weird animal creatures:

One had a cat's face,
One whisked a tail,
One tramped at a rat's pace,
One crawled like a snail,
One like a wombat prowled obtuse and furry
One like a ratel tumbled hurry skurry.

Nothing in Keightley, or *The Arabian Nights* or Hone, except Bottom's head—and there the analogy is very incomplete—can prepare us for these grotesques. Here 'wombat' alone gives the clue. It is known that Christina had an interest, earlier than that of Dante Gabriel Rossetti, in the Zoological Gardens. One group of animals attracted her, sufficiently for her to make sketches of them, and in *The Family Letters*¹ W. M. Rossetti has reproduced Christina's drawings of 'a wombat,' 'a grey squirrel,' and 'a fox.' So the 'wombat' would appear to unite with her childish memories and produce the animal-faced men of *Goblin Market*. She had a number of legends in her reading including the story of Zobeide already mentioned, where humans and devils change into animals. Christina gave each goblin one animal feature, and in this way heightened the magic atmosphere of her poem. The delight which all the Rossetti children took in the Zoological Gardens would have given Christina sufficient incentive for the animal element in the poem. Her enthusiasms were confirmed by Dante Gabriel's early interest in *Peter Parley's Natural History* which led him later to keep an ill-disciplined menagerie at Cheyne Walk².

The main motives of *Goblin Market* would appear therefore to lead back to Christina's childhood, and to the reading of these town-bred, bookish children. Nor in the composition of the poem does she lose sight of this childish atmosphere; the racing metre, the extravagancies of the story, the simplicity of the diction are such as a child could appreciate. The contacts of the poem with Christina's childhood extend beyond these main motives. Her naïve introduction of a moral can be paralleled by the advice on the relationships of brothers and sisters given at the close of the stories in *Peter Parley's Magazine*, a mid-Victorian favourite which the Rossetti children enjoyed. Further, the imagery of the poem, apart from a few Tennysonian derivations, has its contacts with the same early memories. The poem startles one at first both by the variety and the

¹ The dates of the sketches reproduced by W. M. Rossetti are too late to form an origin for this feature in *Goblin Market*. The wombat was not in the Gardens when the Rossettis were children. See *Family Letters*, ed. by W. M. Rossetti, London, 1, p. 39.

² D. G. Rossetti, *Memour etc.*, 1, p. 58.

wildness of its comparisons, and one wonders why shipwrecks, sieges, storms and battles, were made to do service in this magic adventure of Laura and Lizzie. The Rossetti children varied their excursions into Hone, Keightley and Peter Parley with reading of a more violent type, brigand tales, tales of romance and horror, the popular Victorian heritage of the terror tale of the Romantic Period. I would not attempt to assign any image in *Goblin Market* to a particular passage in the adventure-story reading of the Pre-Raphaelite children: the nature of imagery is too complex for such analysis. A single passage from one of the collections which they are known to have read gives, however, the generic similarity. I choose an example from *Tales of Chivalry or Perils by Flood and Field*¹. W. M. Rossetti mentions this volume, and confirmatory evidence that the children knew it well can be found by the presence here² of Henkerwyssel's Challenge, the source of D. G. Rossetti's ballad of *Jan van Hunks*. The following is a passage from the story of *The Flame-girt bark of the Burning Sea* which has additional interest from its parallels with Christina's *A Ballad of Boding*:

And now, when the wild sea rolls and roars, tormented by the wanton wind, and the blue lightning gilds the blackening sky, the affrighted seaman oft has seen the lovers' bark, manned by her crew of corpses, careering over the deep; but her hne of gold is a belt of fire, and the blue is rent from the midnight sky, and her spar and sail are of the northern mist, and her rigging is twined of the stars' faint beams: and around her dash waves of blue, gleaming flame, that show like a sun bright sea.

When one remembers that such was the content and style of the less respectable side of the childhood reading of the Rossettis, one need not be surprised at the storm-swept wildness of some of the imagery in *Goblin Market*.

Such were some of the sources of suggestion which led to *Goblin Market*. Their organisation results in the most secure and attractive of all Christina's poems. To identify the impulses which led her to manipulate them, and the motive which gave them unity would lead one back to Christina's biography and to relating this poem with the rest of her creative work. My own view is that she explored here more fully than elsewhere her impulse towards resignation in her attitude to experience, present in her poetry by 1847.

B. IFOR EVANS.

SHEFFIELD.

¹ *Tales of Chivalry: or Perils by Flood and Field*, 2 vols, London, 1835 (?).

² *Ibid.* II, p. 385.

P. J. BAILEY'S DEBT TO GOETHE'S 'FAUST' IN HIS 'FESTUS'

It has often been stated that P. J. Bailey, in his poem *Festus*, owed a considerable debt to Goethe's *Faust*, but no one has shown in exactly what manner or to what extent he was indebted. Is the idea, as a critic in the *Athenaeum*, December 1839, so cuttingly remarks, 'a mere plagiarism from the *Faust* of Goethe, with all its impiety and scarcely any of its poetry'? Does its philosophy 'out-Herod Kant and out-Goethe Goethe in the introduction of the three persons of the Trinity as interlocutors in its wild plot¹'? Or has Bailey only borrowed from Goethe 'what Goethe borrowed from the book of Job, the grand thought of a permitted temptation²'? Such words of praise or blame imply that *Festus* was great indeed. And there is no doubt that on its first appearance the poem enjoyed an almost fabulous popularity. James Montgomery said that on reading it 'one feels as if one had eaten of the insane root that takes the reason prisoner³'; another of Bailey's contemporaries expressed the opinion that it contained 'poetry enough to set up fifty poets⁴,' while

¹ *The Literary Gazette and Journal of the Belles Lettres*, August 31, p. 508.

² *The Dial*, Boston, 1841, October, p. 245

³ *Festus, a Poem*, edition of 1845. Notices and Literary Opinions appended. Also J. Holland and J. Everett, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of James Montgomery*, v, London, 1856, pp. 360 ff. In a letter (July 18, 1839) Montgomery says: 'More evidence of poetical genius...than I have found in any juvenile work of the kind for ten years past.... The author has hazarded utter ruin and reprobation in the very choice of his subject—the old story of the Devil and Dr Faustus—because it has already been exalted to the "highest heaven of invention" by the greatest of German poets, and of European poets too, in the esteem of some critics, but not in mine, though that may be no disparagement to him. The author of the *Sorrows of Werther*, Goethe, has composed a nondescript drama entitled *Faust*, on the same crazy tradition, by which he has obtained more fame perhaps (mixed with no small infamy, according to my old-fashioned notions), than by any other of his marvellous pieces in prose or rhyme. There is excess in everything in this poem—incidents, scenes, subjects, speeches etc are overwrought and overlaid throughout the volume....The writer (i.e. Bailey) frequently forgets to count his fingers, and his cadences run beyond all bounds of legitimate metre. Had Goethe's *Faust* not been written, this would have been a most unaccountably original effort of invention....'

A foot-note adds. 'The copy of the letter which we use and for which we are indebted to the kindness of Thomas Bailey, Esq., of Nottingham, the poet's father, contains the following note. "Not Faust, but the book of Job, was the original source of the inspiration of *Festus*. T. B." Was the author of this poem, then, unacquainted with its alleged German archetype?'

⁴ J. Searle, *Memoirs of Ebenezer Elliott the Corn Law Rhymers*, London, 1852, p. 160: 'Bailey's *Festus* had a stronger hold of him [Elliott]; but he knew very well how to discriminate between a panorama of pictures and a poetic work of art. His admiration of *Festus* was, therefore, limited to its glorious passages and wild flights of imagination, and to the lyrics scattered through its pages. He severely condemned the theological soliloquies, which darken the last edition of this poem, and so painfully burden its action. "The book," he said, "wanted cutting down before in the first edition, and now it sprawls its unwieldy length to such an appalling extent, that its many and manifest beauties will hardly save it from perishing."'

Tennyson declared, 'I can scarcely trust myself to say how much I admire it, for fear of falling into extravagance¹.' In America it was received with even greater acclamation. Sir Edmund Gosse in an article in the *Fortnightly Review*² said: 'In many a distant home, in America even oftener than in Great Britain, a visit to some invalid's room would reveal the presence of two volumes on the bed, the one a Bible, the other *Festus*.' Between 1839, the year of its first appearance, and 1889, the date of the Jubilee publication, it had run through no less than eleven editions, while thirty pirated copies had appeared in America and eleven in England³.

The fact was that publication of *Festus* coincided with a vague literary revolt against the rigid materialism which Sir Henry Taylor was advocating—a materialism, which would have clipped the wings of poetry and shackled imagination; 'let no man sit down to write with the purpose of making every line and word beautiful and peculiar,' he asserts in his preface to *Philip van Artevelde*, 'for Poetry is Reason's self sublimed⁴.' This attempt to put fancy in chains was in no wise popular. And then came Bailey with his lofty rapture⁵, his vague majesty, his archangels, pinnacles and cloudy palaces, to be hailed as a prophet and poet of the first rank, although like most philosophical poems *Festus* was neither good science nor good poetry. Added to this was the new, if not particularly widespread, Goethe-vogue which had sprung up in England since the beginning of the nineteenth century. During the year 1819 there appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine* articles in praise of the 'German Shakespeare,' and the *Edinburgh Review* was endeavouring to make him known to the people. His earlier works had been reviewed and translated, but *Faust* did not begin to come into its own in this country until the appearance of Lord F. Leveson Gower's translation in 1823, the first connected, although incomplete, version so far available to the reading public. From this time onward, articles, criticisms and translations were constantly appearing. And Goethe's death in 1832 resulted in a further increase in interest. Thus *Faust* came to exercise an extraordinary

¹ *The Life and Works of Alfred, Lord Tennyson*, II, London, 1898, p. 6, where he also says (in a letter to Fitzgerald, November 12, 1846) 'I have just got *Festus*, order it and read. You will most likely find it a great bore, but there are really very grand things in *Festus*.'

² November 1902, pp. 759-775.

³ *The Nahon*, LXXV, September 25, 1902, p. 241: 'Theology and metaphysics...had gradually submerged its early attractiveness and made it at last unreadable to those who were compeers and spectators of its early fame.'

⁴ *Philip van Artevelde, a Dramatic Romance*, London, 1834. The Preface, pp. xxii, xxv, also xxiv, 'but imagination and passion, thus unsupported, will never make a poet.'

⁵ Cf. Madox Brown's *Diary*, ed. by W. Rossetti (*Pre-Raphaelite Diaries*), November 8, 1849: 'Patmore, talking of Philip Bailey, remarked that he seems "to be painting on clouds, not having his foot on reality."'

influence over the younger poets, who were received with a somewhat exaggerated praise during the interval between the disappearance of the older writers and the rise of a new school under Tennyson and Browning. Hence the success of this poem by a mere youth of twenty-three was prodigious, but, like a comet, it burnt itself out. It is a book whose fame rather than whose importance demands recognition.

Bailey was born in Nottingham on April 22, 1816, where his father was for some time editor and proprietor of the *Nottingham Mercury*¹. Thomas Bailey evidently recognised the latent talent of his son, and not only encouraged his predilection for literature by warm sympathy, but directed his reading and cultivated his tastes. When a lad of eight he was taken to see Byron's lying-in-state at the old Blackamoor's Head in Nottingham market-place². He had not then begun to write verses, but two years later found him penning very juvenile attempts. In his sixteenth year he matriculated at Glasgow University with the intention of entering the Presbyterian ministry, a project which he shortly afterwards abandoned. Instead, he commenced to study law in a London solicitor's office and was entered in 1835 as a member of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn. He was formally called to the Bar in 1840, but never practised. The scheme of *Festus* had meanwhile taken a definite hold on his imagination, and in 1836 he retired to his father's house at Old Basford, 'in order that he might be free to devote himself entirely to what he had already conceived to be his life work³.' Here for close upon three years he gave himself up to the writing of *Festus*. 'I had time at my disposal—in those days I did pretty much as I liked—and I soon found myself making progress with *Festus*. I had the theory of the poem in my mind, and the plan of working it out, as well as the conception of the main characters. I knew that theology was not popular and that was probably why I embodied it in the work. The doctrine of Universalism had never been introduced into poetry, and in that respect *Festus* was different from anything that had previously appeared. That was the novel characteristic of the poem⁴.' Truly, a Miltonian task for a young poet! 'A sketch of world life, a summary of its combined moral and physical conditions, estimated on a theory of spiritual things opposed as

¹ For Bailey's life see *Dictionary of National Biography*, Second Supplement, 1, 1912, p. 78; James Ward, *Recollections of P. J. Bailey* (pamphlet), 1905; V. G. Plarr, *Men and Women of the Time*, London, 1889, p. 49; Cornelius Brown, *The Worthies of Nottinghamshire and Celebrated and Remarkable Men of that County*, Nottingham, 1881; R. Mellors, *Men of Nottingham and Notts*, 1926; Chambers's *Cyclopaedia of English Literature*.

² J. A. Hammerton, "P. J. Bailey and his Work," in the *Sunday Magazine*, London, 1898, pp. 45–52.

³ James Ward, *Personal Recollections*. Nottingham, 1905.

⁴ A. Mee, "An Evening with P. J. Bailey," in *The Young Man*, October 1896, pp. 334–7.

far as possible to that of the partialist, pessimist and despairing sceptic¹. The poem was published anonymously in 1839, when he was barely twenty-three, and throughout his long life he remained the author of *Festus*. He died in 1902. Had it not been for *Festus* he would probably have passed into oblivion with the rest of the so-called spasmodic poets².

The story of the poem is briefly as follows. Lucifer appears in Heaven and asks and gains permission of God to tempt Festus to his ruin, albeit with the foregone conclusion of his ultimate salvation. He becomes the accepted companion of Festus by promising to set him on a throne, 'the throne of will unbound.' Together they visit Heaven and Hell, Space, the Moon, the Centre, Anywhere and Everywhere (through a kind of spiritual transmigration, as one critic suggests). Various love-episodes occur, thus bearing testimony to Lucifer's promise to Festus, 'that he should love ten as others love but one'; indeed, he snatches the last fair one from the arms of Lucifer himself. Finally, having exhausted all kinds of human pleasure, he demands to be king of the world—and this is granted him—for one day. He dies, and being repentant is saved, and Lucifer, as he bids him farewell, asks his forgiveness. This comprises the whole action. One or two passages, however, might be noted which suggest a closer connexion with *Faust*. Bailey begins his poem with a dedication and then opens with a scene in Heaven and the request to lead Festus astray:

God. What wouldst thou, Lucifer?
 Lucifer. There is a youth
 Among the sons of men, I fain would have
 Given up wholly to me.
 God. He is thine to tempt.
 Lucifer. I thank thee, God.
 God. Upon his soul
 Thou hast no power.

Already the mention of Festus as a youth made unnecessary a scene such as that in the Witches' Kitchen in Goethe's poem. He, too, is oppressed with the frailty of human nature and the transitoriness of all things. When the tempter abruptly appears to his meditating victim his startled, 'Who art thou pray?' echoes Faust's, 'Wie nennst du dich?' while his terror reminds one rather of Faust and the Earth Spirit. At the opening of one scene—I say advisedly one scene, since the reader soon loses count of time and space in an endeavour to understand the endless discussions—Festus' description of a sunrise is not unlike Faust's

¹ See the preface to the fiftieth anniversary edition, 1893, p. 1.

² W. E. Aytoun (under the pseudonym 'T. P. Jones') laughed to scorn these so-called spasmodics in his burlesque poem, *Firmilian*, 1854.

soliloquy on Easter morning, and he catechises Lucifer concerning the inhabitants of Hell in a way that suggests the *Dr Faustus* of Marlowe. In the pact, which cannot be taken seriously in the light of Bailey's unbounded optimism, no time limit is set. Later, as Festus and his companion are watching the throng pass by, a funeral procession approaches; they are bearing the body of Angela, one of Festus' many loves, she has died of grief. The mention of the word love brings us to an even greater divergence between Bailey's work and Goethe's. What have all Bailey's shadows, women in name only, in common with Gretchen? A printer's error, which put Helen's speech into the mouth of Clara, or even of Lucifer himself, for that matter, would probably pass unnoticed. They might be disciples of Plato, discussing abstracts of life, for all the individuality they possess. The inquiring student, tutored by Lucifer, is not more desirous of knowledge than they, and even the crowd, instead of being regaled with wine, is subjected, like everyone else, to a discourse on salvation and damnation. Another scene is headed, 'An Hour's Ride.' 'Wilt ride?' asks Lucifer, Festus assents and with the cry, 'Be mine the steeds,' they start off together to ride the world from Tartarland to America. In 'Another and A Better World' Festus demands to see Angela, 'that sweet soul thou broughtest to me the first night that we met.' 'Is that not she,' inquires Lucifer, 'Walking alone, uplooking to the earth?' Perhaps one of the most decided echoes of Goethe occurs in a scene labelled, 'An Entertainment,' where one of the company attracts Festus' attention to Lucifer by saying,

Your friend hath led his lady out,
He looks most wickedly devout,

whereupon another answers,

When introduced he said he knew her
And had been long devoted to her.

So we come to the final judgment scene.

Recording Angel. All men are judged save one.

Son of God. He too is saved!

Lucifer. Is he not mine?

God. Evil away for aye!

For I abide not sin; and in my Son
There is no sin.

These last lines are but a repetition of the gist of the whole poem; Festus is saved because, 'with all his doubts he never doubted'; and he can now pass on to very union with God himself.

The foregoing short synopsis, however, in no way conveys an adequate idea of this colossus. Indeed, the intense seriousness of the author alone

gives it a ring of sincerity. Only this first edition of 1839 bears any decided resemblance to *Faust*, for, as time passed, Bailey thought more and more of the doctrine, which he was endeavouring to make known, and paid less and less attention to the plot itself, with the very natural result that the poem too often degenerates into mere poetic outbursts of mixed metaphors, crude metaphysics and bewildering theology. To the distracted reader it soon appears one long unnecessary argument. All the characters argue; Festus assails the ears of his ladies with such highfalutin' rant as no one would listen to patiently for any length of time. Lucifer seems to have left all his fire and brimstone behind him, and except for 'a diabolic taste for conflagrations'¹ and occasional flashes of Satanic wit—'it is Hell's sabbath when I come—Hell's Hell,' or, 'I should like to macadamize the world; the road to Hell wants mending'—has become a most edifying and obliging spirit; in fact the father of lies tells no more falsehoods than Festus and quite as much truth.

The almost fabulous success of this his first work had made Bailey over-optimistic as to his literary productivity. 'Had Shakespeare, during his lifetime, received half the praise which has fallen to this man, he would probably have died—or done worse—of too much glory,' declared the *American Whig Review*²; 'that such a book as *Festus* should jump into a reputation which *Paradise Lost* has even yet hardly grown into, is truly a most significant phenomenon; one which we shall be apt to regard as ominous or auspicious according to our faith in human progress.' This prophecy proved correct. Bailey's later poems, such as *The Angel World* (1850), *The Mystic* (1855) and *The Universal Hymn* (1858), were failures, and the author, finding that they lacked appeal, resorted to the subterfuge of incorporating them all in the insatiable *Festus*. The result was that, at the time of the Jubilee edition, the original stripling of some three hundred and sixty pages had grown into a monster of seven hundred and forty-nine pages, or roughly forty thousand lines of blank verse.

And the contemporary critics? They were unanimous in ascribing the original germ of the plot to Goethe's *Faust*. But in this they were understood to be speaking of the book as a whole. For where the whole was so original, many parts could afford to be borrowed. 'The germinal idea,' said Moir³, 'originated no doubt in Goethe's *Faust*, but the poem of the great German is not less distinguished for its high art as a composition, than for its daring speculative philosophy.' '*Festus* has no claim to the

¹ *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, LVII, April 1850, p. 415.

² January 1847, pp. 43-61.

³ D. M. Moir, *Sketches of the Poetical Literature of the Past Half-Century*, Edinburgh, 1851, p. 323.

former attribute, for, in point of style, it is utterly loose and disjointed.' There was nothing to be said for it on the score of originality of design; 'it is impossible,' said the *Eclectic Review*¹, 'that a more palpable imitation of *Faust* could be conceived or executed.' The machinery of the poem was nothing less than a compound of *Faust* and Byron's *Cain*. As for its philosophy, 'it is the worn out story of the vanity of human life'; and 'it required neither Dr Johnson, nor the far greater minds of Byron and Goethe to proclaim this to us. *Faust* and *Childe Harold* are but echoes of this unquestioned truism, and had not the author of *Festus* given us a glimpse of a higher creed and faith, we should have flung his volume aside¹.' As it was, he had contrived to commit all the oldest sins in the newest kind of way. Other critics could trace the effect of *Manfred*, which may, they admit, have resulted from a common study of *Faust*. One American² even classed it with the *Iliad*, *Macbeth* and *Paradise Lost*, a classification which was in no way so lucid as it was flattering. In the *Dial*³ for October 1841-2 we find, 'From Goethe he borrowed what Goethe borrowed from the book of Job.. Goethe has shown the benefits of deepening individual consciousness. The author of *Festus* dwells rather upon an all-enfolding love, which brings a peculiar flower from the slough of Despond. Lucifer has not the cold polished irony of Goethe's Mephistopheles.' Lucifer does, in fact, do all in his power to elevate the thoughts of his pupil and enlarge the bounds of his knowledge. He is an intellectual evil, the embodiment of necessity. *Festus* was, then, according to all critics, a wilderness of weeds and flowers; the point of contention among them was whether the weeds or the flowers were more numerous; whether in spite of the many 'passages of genuine and glorious poetry⁴' it is only 'the most healthful piece of diseased intelligence⁵,' or, not only 'bad Christianity but bad grammar⁶.' It was not a great poem, but it attempted to teach a great doctrine—the doctrine of universal salvation; it was the method rather than the theology that was at fault, as the lively literary Caliban of the time (Robert Buchanan) pointed out in the *Spectator* for September 1866:

Remoter sat Bailey—satirical, surly—
Who studied the language of Goethe too soon,
Who sang himself hoarse to the stars very early,
And crack'd a weak voice with too lofty a tune.

¹ *Eclectic Review*, VI, London, 1839, pp. 654-64.

² See Notices and Literary Opinions at end of 1848 edition, where it is wrongly attributed to *The Christian Examiner*, Boston, instead of to *The Universalist Quarterly and General Review*, XII, October 1845, p. 409.

³ *The Dial*, Boston, October 1841, p. 245.

⁴ *The Literary Gazette*, August 31, 1839, p. 508.

⁵ *The Eclectic Review*, June 1865, London, I, pp. 540-56.

⁶ *The New Englander*, New Haven, Conn., V, pp. 175 ff.

Bailey, when asked in an interview what induced him to write *Festus*, replied¹:

'Well, when I was in my teens, *Faust* was exercising a great hold on the mind of the public, Goethe's poem was being discussed everywhere. Like the rest I read it and was deeply interested in it; interested but not satisfied. The character of Mephistopheles, admirably drawn, immitable in its cynicism, powerful in its poetical outline, struck me as being a false representation of the power of evil in its relationship to man. Goethe's Mephistopheles seemed to me—and this applies to the whole poem—too materialistic. It left the world problem unsolved; it carried no ennobling message; it was, in a word, unsatisfying.'

'Then you determined to point the upward way... by giving the devil his due, so to speak...'

'That was my purpose. Not, be it remembered, that I had the temerity to think of facing Goethe as a poet, or that I hoped to do much to nullify the materialistic tendencies which *Faust* was calculated to strengthen and promote. But as one who had gone to the great work of the German author with open mind and had come away unsatisfied, I was impelled to give utterance to the faith that was in me; a faith that has only strengthened with the lapse of years.'

This was in the year 1898, when he was already an old man and the forces which had influenced him as a youth appeared simpler than they really were. Shortly after the publication of *Childe Harold*, Thomas Bailey had given his son a copy, which he at once learned by heart, and throughout his life it remained one of his favourite poems. Even as an old man he passed many a sleepless night by repeating some of the cantos to himself². In his library contemporary authors were but sparsely represented, but among his most treasured possessions were a first edition of Browning's *Paracelsus*³, a gift from poet to poet, for Browning and he were close friends, two quarto volumes of *Paradise Lost*, and several curious examples of the small chap-books which were popular when Bailey was a boy. These represented the investments of occasional sixpences, which he had been given; 'instead of buying sweets he went in for literature.' The coincidence is in some ways remarkable, but Bailey would only admit the coincidence; he did not attribute the germ of *Festus* to these. It was not to be a mere reproduction of any-

¹ Interview by J. A. Hammerton in *The Sunday Magazine*, 1898, pp 45-52.

² See *Notes and Queries*, September 1902.

³ According to his niece, Miss F. C. Carey, 'my uncle and Mr Browning had so great an admiration for each other's genius.' *Notes and Queries*, l.c., p. 242.

thing that had as yet appeared, unlike, for instance¹, 'the spiritual teachings,' insisted on by Milton, in his 'confused Arianism'; by Byron, in his 'intermittent scepticism and reiterated Manichaeism'; by Shelley, in his 'rapid and irrational atheism.' Or even if, extending our view beyond our English cycle of bards, we were to include, 'through translation, that vast jumble of Greek and Gothic fable laid before the world by Goethe in his divisional and therefore aesthetically unsatisfactory production, *Faust*'; Goethe, according to Bailey, had in his work abandoned altogether the purport of the national legend which he had set himself to handle, the very core of which was the inefficacy of repentance as opposed to the prophetic teachings of the Bible. He did not, it is obvious, in any way realise the true greatness of *Faust*. He was frankly disappointed, for Goethe,

after showing the learned Doctor, in company with Mephistopheles, an evil imp it appears of a mean and subordinate class, teaching and preaching a sensuous and impure Pantheism to the victim of their united attentions, she, after such undermining of her moral nature, beguiled into the commission of parricide, constructive fratricide, and finally of infanticide, only it is painfully evident over-conscious of a somewhat too voluntary sacrifice; and concluding the first section of the story with the death in jail, and the announcement by a divine voice from heaven of the unconditional salvation of the interesting heroine, commences the second segments of the story (not the shadow of a trace being visible from first to last of the circumstances attending the close of the hero's mortal career, and of his pitiful compunction and repentance, made so much of by Marlowe and in the primitive tradition) with the resuscitation of the amiable and ever fascinating Faust, in an Elysium or fairyland sort of scene, where he endeavours to while away the time by a double adultery with Helen of Troy, and other repulsive incidents as the results of such a brilliant invention; until after the smothering of Mephistopheles by the celestial saints beneath showers of roses, and the separation of Faust's humanity into elements partly perishable and partly divine; the whole terminates in the worshipful glorification of eternal wifelyhood; a fact, of which in the respective cases of Margaret and Helen of Troy he had shown such a keen and delicate appreciation....¹

Bailey had, however, a definite theory to illustrate, not of divinity, but humanity, in a future spiritual condition, purifying and progressive. No wonder a critic² remarked, 'His egotism almost approaches that point of the sublime where it topples over into the ridiculous.' Hence, considering all things, his debt to Goethe is not considerable. His early acquaintance with the book of Job—when a lad he had written an essay descriptive of his impressions of it, for his father—his admiration for such contemporary poems as *Paracelsus* and *Childe Harold*, his preference, as a child, for Dante and Milton³ must, of necessity, have left their mark, although the legend of Dr Faustus in the old chap-books and Leveson Gower's translation of Goethe undoubtedly left some traces behind. In later years

¹ Robertson Nicoll and T. J. Wise, *Literary Anecdotes of Nineteenth Century*, II, pp. 413-18.

² *Whig Journal*, II, July 1845, p. 55.

³ *Light*, September 21, 1889.

Bailey travelled on the continent, but there is no evidence of his having visited Germany, so that his interest in that respect cannot have been very great. He may have had a scanty knowledge of the language, although this was not necessary in order to become acquainted with Goethe. The only direct reference to the German poet in his works appears in *The Age*, where he says

Wolfgang's Faust flames forth the fire divine,
In many a solid thought and glowing line¹.

'Had Mr Bailey trespassed further than he has done on the domain of Goethe, he must have taken his place among the straw-gatherers,' writes the *British Quarterly Review* for 1846², 'but he has contented himself with occupying the very advantageous position pointed out by his predecessor, and when once there, has commenced building on his own account.' It is, indeed, this 'building on his own account' which has not only obscured but almost entirely obliterated any definite borrowings from Goethe, and resulted in so many thousand lines of dreary mystical monologue. We entirely concur with the critic³ who said, 'We, surely, should not complain of a system that would effectually banish Satan from the Universe; but we do complain when he is left, shorn of his greatness and his glory.' So this *Festus*, which was '*Faust* emasculated, trimmed and scented, and sent forth on a harmless round among the circulating libraries⁴,' which almost a century ago had aroused such enthusiasm in the breast of William Howitt⁵, that he read it in a tone 'that was almost a chaunt,' is now forgotten. When Bailey died in 1902 it 'followed its author into oblivion⁶.'

GRETA A. BLACK.

ROCHESTER.

¹ *The Age, a Colloquial Satire*, London, 1858, p. 109

² *III*, pp. 377-91.

³ *Universalist Quarterly and General Review*, Boston, October 1845, pp. 385-411.

⁴ F. B. Sanborn, *The Life and Genius of Goethe*, Boston, 1886, p. 184.

⁵ See Cornelius Brown, *Lives of Nottingham Worthies*, London, 1882; S. T. Hall, *The Howitts*, pp. 355-60.

⁶ *Athenaeum*, September 13, 1902, p. 350

WAS THERE A FRENCH ORIGINAL OF THE 'AMADÍS DE GAULA'?

WHEN Azurara, writing his *Chronica do Conde dom Pedro de Menezes* about 1460, mentioned in passing that Vasco de Lobeira was the author of the *Amadis*, he could not have foreseen that he was giving rise to a controversy which, nearly five hundred years later, is almost as far from a satisfactory conclusion as it was at the beginning. It is not proposed here to retell the complicated story of the discussion, for this has been done in a complete and yet concise manner by Miss G. S. Williams in her article 'The Amadís Question' in *Revue Hispanique*, XXI, No. 59, September 1909. It will suffice briefly to indicate the chief points on which a certain measure of agreement has been reached.

I. STATE OF THE PROBLEM AT PRESENT.

The *Amadis* was certainly known in Castile before 1350, for it is mentioned in the Castilian translation of Egidio de Colonna's *De Regimine Principum* made about that year, and, as Pero Ferrus refers to the three books of *Amadis* about 1379, it is probable that the original consisted of the same number. López de Ayala, who was born in 1322, says in his *Rimado de Palacio* that he had wasted much time in reading the *Amadis*, and, as this was most likely in his youth, it again points to the existence of the book about 1350, which makes it practically impossible that it should be the work of the Vasco de Lobeira who was knighted on the field of Aljubarrota in 1385. From Montalvo's own statement it appears that a certain Infante don Alfonso of Portugal had secured the alteration of one of the episodes in the novel, and this Infante may have been either the son of Dinis, who became king on his father's death in 1325, or the brother of Dinis who went to Castile in 1304, married a sister of Don Juan Manuel and died in 1312. The reason for suggesting the brother is that Juan de Lobeira, a contemporary of his, was the author of a song which appears, with some changes, in the *Amadis*, and it is argued that he may have been the author of the whole book and that Azurara, in assigning it to Vasco de Lobeira, merely made a mistake in the first name. This is, however, a weak argument, and it is easier to believe that the song, which existed separately—it is found in the *Cancionero Colocci-Brancuti*—was borrowed by the author, especially as a third stanza has been added to those found in the *Cancionero*, apparently for the purpose of adapting it

to the circumstances of the story. It is on the whole more probable that the Infante referred to was the son and not the brother of Dinis. If that is so, we can carry the date of the book back before 1325, and even then we have not arrived at the original. For, as Menéndez y Pelayo points out with great force in his *Orígenes de la Novela*, I, p. cex, it cannot be supposed that an emendation which fundamentally changed the whole nature of the story and the character of its hero could have been imposed on the author himself even to gratify a prince. We seem, therefore, to be dealing merely with a translator or adapter of a story already in existence. That is as far as we can get in the history of the book, and all we can say with fair certainty is that it must have been composed about 1320 or earlier.

As to the nationality of the author and the language in which he wrote, absolutely nothing can be stated definitely, but it has been generally assumed throughout the controversy that he must have been either Castilian or Portuguese. The assertion of Nicolas de Herberay, Seigneur des Essarts, the first translator of the *Amadis* into French in the first half of the sixteenth century, that it was an adaptation from a Picard original, and the amplification of this assertion by the Comte de Tressan in the Preface to his translation in 1779 have rightly been rejected, as they are unsupported by any proof.

II. NARROW SCOPE OF THE ENQUIRIES HITHERTO MADE.

The arguments on the one side and on the other have for the most part been based on statements made about the book by persons other than the author. References have, of course, been made to the nature of the book as a whole, as for example that the spirit of it is entirely contrary to that displayed in admittedly Castilian literature, from which it is argued that it must have been written by a Portuguese author, or that it bears strong resemblance to the French Arthurian prose romances. But these references have been of a very general nature, and there has been singularly little attempt to do what is usually considered to be the essential thing in elucidating the date and authorship of a work when these are uncertain, namely, to examine the work itself in detail and to endeavour to draw deductions from what is found in it, or to establish a possible connexion between the subject-matter and events in the external world contemporary with the date of authorship. Miss Willhams has, therefore, performed a very useful service in the article in question by her careful collation of passages from the *Amadis* and the French Arthurian romances. The result makes it abundantly clear that the

author of the *Amadís*, especially in the first two books and also, but not so largely, in the third book, followed the romances very closely indeed, though, as Miss Williams says, 'The one who thus levied upon these tales was no mere workman who followed blindly a pattern already set for him by another, but an artist who had his own design, and having it took here and there ruthlessly whatever the execution demanded' (*op. cit.* p. 147). She further gives it as her opinion from a careful examination of these passages that it was the original French romances and not Spanish translations of them that were used. Yet this carries us very little further on the quest for authorship, for it is quite possible that a Spaniard or a Portuguese might have been intimately acquainted with the French romances, and Miss Williams expressly refrains from drawing any conclusions with respect to this. 'We have no sufficient evidence on which to frame a judgment. Of all the theories we can simply say this, that any one of them may be proved—perhaps—but every one of them remains to be proved, and that with the evidence now at our disposal is impossible' (*ibid.* p. 38).

III. A NEW LINE OF APPROACH.

The purpose of the present article is to see whether any further light can be cast on the question by continuing the process of scrutinising the internal evidence along lines not, so far as is known, hitherto touched, and by correlating it with the facts of the political situation at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Can we make the book itself by its characters and its episodes tell us anything of the circumstances in which or the period at which it was written—assuming as we must, and as we have fair reason to assume, that the original version coincided in broad outline with the first three books of Montalvo's work, that, whatever he meant by 'correcting' the originals, he probably confined his alterations more to the manner of telling the story than to the matter told?

IV. WHAT COUNTRY IS MEANT BY GAULA?

The first question that naturally arises is, what country was the Gaula to which *Amadís* belonged? The obvious reply is that it was Gaul, or France. And yet it seems that there was much doubt about this in the minds of the readers of Montalvo's romance, for Bernardo Tasso, who visited Spain and founded an epic on the *Amadís*, wrote in 1558 that Gaula was frequently taken to mean Gales, or Wales, though he himself was convinced that the original author intended it for France and accordingly he entitled his poem *Amadigi di Francia*. Baret in *De*

l'Amadis de Gaule (1853) and Braunfels in his *Kritischer Versuch über den Roman Amadis von Gallien* (1876) give some reasons from internal evidence for thinking that it might mean Wales, and later Menéndez y Pelayo in his *Orígenes de la Novela* bluntly states that it is Wales, though without giving any reasons. That the Spaniards of the sixteenth century might confuse Gaula and Gales is not unnatural, considering that Gaula is a wholly learned word for France, not in use except among the erudite who formed only a small portion of those who devoured the *Libros de Caballería*, whereas Gales was well known; moreover, as the story is concerned mainly with events in England where Amadis had become, as it were, a naturalised subject, this would tend to make them associate him with a country more closely linked to England than is France. But that the original author meant France seems to follow from the fact that Little Britain and Germany are reached overland from Gaula, and that when the characters go from England to Gaula, or *vice versa*, as they do many times, they go by sea, except in one instance in which Perion, King of Gaula, appears to reach the court of King Languines of Scotland overland. (For details, see Williams, *op. cit.* pp. 43-6.) The geographical evidence is therefore mainly in favour of Gaula being on the continent, and the one instance to the contrary should not be allowed to negative it. Moreover, the fact that Perion's chief counsellors, whom he consults about the interpretation of his dream, are Ungan el Picardo and Alberto de Campaña seems irresistible evidence that he is King of France and not of Wales. Further, there is no doubt at all that in the French Arthurian romances there is a clear distinction between Gaule meaning France and Gales meaning Wales. In the first few lines of the *Lancelot del Lac* there is the statement that Claudas of 'la tierre deserte' was a liege of the King of Gaule 'now called France,' and every reference to Gaule throughout the romances shows that France is meant. Gales, on the other hand, is not a separate kingdom but merely a geographical region within which several towns and castles are placed, but there are separate kingdoms of Norgales, North Wales, and Sorgales, South Wales, and these are clearly countries reached by land from England. If, therefore, as Miss Williams' article clearly shows, the author of the *Amadis* closely followed the French romances, there is every reason to suppose that he, like them, meant France when he spoke of Gaula. He nowhere mentions Gales as such, but one of the characters is King Arban of Norgales who is one of Lisuarte's most trusted counsellors, and his kingdom is entirely different from that of Gaula.

V. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE ROMANCES AND THE 'AMADÍS' AND THEIR RELATION TO THE PROBLEM.

Miss Williams has dealt with the points of resemblance between the *Amadís* and the French romances, but, beyond remarking that the third book shows greater originality and introduces episodes for which parallels cannot be found in the romances, she does not pay any attention to the points of difference. I do not refer here to the difference in spirit which is immediately obvious and has been dealt with at length by all the commentators on the *Amadís*, but to differences in detail in the treatment of matter which is common to both the *Amadís* and the romances. For when an author who as a rule closely follows his sources departs from them, there is probably some reason for the departure, and a consideration of the points of difference may lead to further light being thrown on the circumstances in which the book was written.

(a) *Geography of the Romances.*

England is imagined as split up into many petty kingdoms against which, as well as against the invading Saxons, Arthur has to fight. Many of them are of course imaginary, or at least if they ever represented, in the original 'matière de Bretagne,' local areas under tribal leaders of the British, it is quite impossible now to identify them. But there are many indications given of their geographical relationship to identifiable regions. Thus Carmelide, of whose King Leodegan Guinevere is the daughter, adjoins Arthur's own realm; Gorre marches with Sorgales, Sorestan with Norgales, and Sorelois is bounded on one side by Arthur's country and on the other by the sea. This last had been conquered by Galehout, Lord of the Estraignes Illes, or Lointaines Illes, which, according to Professor Brugger (in *Arthuriana*, II, 1929-30), are the Innsi-Gall of Irish legend, the Hebrides, Islands of the Strangers, i.e., of the Vikings who had a kingdom there for centuries. It is evident that all alike are thought of as constituting a more or less definite and compact region in or close to the British Isles.

Scotland is referred to as a separate kingdom and, following the tradition of Geoffrey of Monmouth, is represented as hostile to England, though later, in face of the Saxon menace, it fights on Arthur's side. But it does not play a large part and has no separate individuality; there is nothing to distinguish it from any of the other kingdoms whose only function is to breed kings and knights who fight with or against Arthur.

There are, in fact, two main areas of action in the romances, the

British Isles, consisting of the aforesaid real and imaginary divisions, and France, where, apart from the kingdoms of Benoic and Gannes, which are specifically stated to be on the borders of Little Britain and Gaule, we are dealing with well-known names—Bourges where Claudas lived, La Rochelle where Arthur lands when he invades France, the Loire, Auvergne, Gascony, Flanders, Burgundy where Arthur defeats the army of the Emperor of Rome. Other countries beyond Great Britain and France are mentioned—Germany, whose King Frolle marches into Gaule to establish a claim to the vacant throne, and is there defeated and killed by Arthur; Denmark, from which a Prince comes to Arthur's Court; Spain, where Tristan wanders when he has to flee from the wrath of King Mark and which is known to possess the famous shrine of St James; and Arthur's fame reaches even to Constantinople, so that the son of the emperor comes to take part in the wars against the Saxons. But all the action takes place in Great Britain or France and the other countries are mere names.

(b) *Geography of the 'Amadis.'*

(i) *England.*

In the *Amadis* Great Britain is again the chief scene of action—Gaula as a country recedes into the background—and, beyond the nucleus of real geographical fact, it is continued by imaginary territories such as Sobradisa and the Insula Firme, while other fanciful lands are scattered about the seas at a distance. But this England is markedly different from that of the romances—not unnaturally, considering that the latter were based on legends dating from a time when England was a chaos of warring tribes and Saxon invaders. It has become a powerful and stable feudal realm under a king who is not simply *primus inter pares*, as Arthur was, but a monarch exalted above all his subjects, in fact the ruler of the ideal feudal system which was always in men's thoughts to be striven after, however much actual feudal rulers fell short of it. The multitude of petty kings who fight with or against Arthur have disappeared; it is true that Arcalaus engineers a revolt of seven tributary kings, whose realms are outside of Great Britain, against Lisuarte, but that episode is evidently taken direct from the romances and the kings are not given names or kingdoms. In fact, the only purely imaginary kingdoms mentioned are Sobradisa and Serolis which are apparently thought of as adjoining Great Britain. Within England the places named are for the most part different from those of the romances, and the general effect is one of

182 *Was there a French Original of the 'Amadís de Gaula'?*

greater reality. London and Windsor are Lisuarte's principal places of residence with Fenusa, which may be Pevensey. Bristoya (Bristol) is frequently mentioned and various ports which have imaginary names, from and to which men sail to the continent. There are, of course, numerous forests to provide settings for the knightly adventures—one of them near Windsor, reserved for the king's hunting, is evidently the New Forest—and one or two big earldoms are referred to.

(ii) *Scotland.*

Scotland has emerged from the indeterminate background of petty kingdoms and is a clearly realised separate entity. Several towns in it are mentioned and it stands on a footing of equality with England with which its relations are friendly and intimate; it sides, however, with Amadís against Lisuarte when the split occurs between them. It occupies, in fact, a position second in importance only to England itself. When Amadís is exposed at birth he is rescued by a Scottish knight, taken to Scotland and brought up there, first at his foster-father's house and later at the court of King Languines until he is of age to receive knighthood. Thus, if environment be allowed any weight, the position of unquestioned superiority in the ranks of chivalry which Amadís subsequently attains must be attributed, in part at least, to the Scottish influences of his early years. In Scotland, too, Lisuarte leaves his daughter Oriana, and there Amadís meets her and dedicates himself to her service. When they both depart to enter the wider world of Lisuarte's kingdom each is accompanied by a Scottish attendant, Amadís by his faithful Squire Gandalín, son of his foster-father, and Oriana by Languines' daughter Mabilia. These two play important parts throughout the entire course of events, sharing the fortunes of Amadís and Oriana to the end and acting as confidants to whom they freely unbosom themselves. Mabilia in particular is an attractive character with more personality than most of the women in the *Libros de Caballería*, especially sweet-tempered, kind and gracious to those of all social positions and with a distinct sense of humour.

(iii) *Other Countries.*

As regards countries beyond the limits of the British Isles and France, some of those mentioned in the romances appear in the *Amadís* and are more intimately linked with the events of the novel. A Prince of Scotland marries a Princess of Norway; Lisuarte marries a Princess of Denmark

and lives in that country for some time before he succeeds to the throne of England; the *Doncella de Denamarca*, who is never given a personal name, is a constant attendant on Oriana. But it is the new countries introduced for the first time in the *Amadis* that provide the greatest interest and afford, as we shall see later, the most valuable clues to the nationality of the author. Amadís sojourns for a whole winter in Bohemia and assists the king to maintain his rights against the usurping Emperor of Rome, who is claiming part of Bohemia on the ground that it once formed part of the Empire, an act that stands Amadís in good stead later when Bohemia's contingent is of the greatest use in the fight with Lisuarte.

From Bohemia Amadís goes on to Romania—no fanciful country, for that was the collective name of the several principalities carved out of Greece from the remnants of the Byzantine Empire after its conquest by the Crusaders in 1204—and it is evident that here again the author imagined it as having an independent existence and characteristics of its own.

From Romania Amadís reaches Constantinople, and once more, instead of a passing reference, we have a clearly conceived picture of a magnificent court with all the appurtenances of a luxurious civilisation, stately buildings and great wealth. Not that it corresponded very closely with the reality; the old Byzantine pre-eminence in culture and wealth, which during the Middle Ages offered such a contrast to the poverty and squalor of the western courts, had been much reduced by the Latin conquest of 1204. But it was natural and allowable in a writer of romance that his descriptions should be affected by that glamour, as of an almost fairylike realm, which had been cast about it by the imagination of centuries of semi-barbaric peoples in the west. For our purpose the important thing is that we see from these descriptions that Constantinople had become something more than a mere name.

(c) *Sense of Actuality in the 'Amadis.'*

We have seen that the geographical background of the *Amadis* is wider and more closely related to fact than would be expected from an author who relied solely on the romances. But we can go further and show that episodes or descriptions in which the *Amadis* differs from the romances frequently seem to contain reminiscences of real events that occurred not long before the probable date of the novel, and these again help to indicate the nationality of the author.

(1) *England.*

One of the great earldoms referred to several times is that of Clara. This looks like a reference to the family of Claire, really Earls of Hertfordshire but generally known as Earls of Claire from their original seat on the borders of Essex and Suffolk. They were Normans who had come over with William the Conqueror and were among the most powerful barons of the realm—Gilbert, who died in 1295, was probably the greatest of Edward I's subjects—until the male line died out in 1314 and the estates passed into other hands.

Another detail that gives an impression of reality is the position of King Arban of Norgales, or North Wales. In the romances that kingdom was hostile to Arthur, but in the *Amadis* Arban lives almost permanently at the court of Lisuarte and is one of his counsellors. There was, in fact, an independent kingdom of North Wales, one of the rulers of which, Llywelyn, was also a powerful English baron who took part in the struggle against John, married Henry III's half-sister and lived mainly in England. His grandson, another Llywelyn, was recognised in 1267 as Prince of Wales and, even after his revolt in 1277, was allowed to retain his title on doing homage to Edward I, and he married Simon de Montfort's daughter. It is true that in a second revolt in 1283 he was killed and Wales was annexed to the Crown, but it is not unlikely that the memory of the prince who was also a great English noble might have lingered on.

One more historical event may possibly be reflected in an incident in the *Amadis*. The Duque de Bristoya (the mediæval spelling of Bristol is Bristow which accounts for the Spanish form of the name), who is an entirely new figure unknown to the romances, joins the allied kings in revolt against Lisuarte, and his presence there seems odd as he is the only one of Lisuarte's direct subjects—except the enchanter Arcalaus—who does so. There never has been a Duke of Bristol, and the peerage which takes its title from that town was not created till the seventeenth century, but the town itself, which had been included in the grant made by Henry III to Prince Edward on his marriage with Eleanor of Castile, did revolt against the prince in 1263 and nearly succeeded in taking him prisoner in the castle. It remained independent for two years, and in 1312 it again revolted against Edward's son Edward II, and defied all the king's writs till it was captured by force of arms in 1316. It would appear as though the author had some personal reason for introducing Bristol into the story, for it was not at that time a place of such importance as to

attract notice abroad, and it stands out curiously as the only identifiable town mentioned except London and Windsor, which were famous enough in themselves to explain their inclusion. If, then, the author had heard of the city's twice repeated defiance of the royal power, he might have adapted it for the purposes of his story—in which no one of less than royal or aristocratic birth takes part—by endowing the place with a duke and making him the protagonist of revolt.

(ii) *Scotland*.

Not only has Scotland gained in importance, but it and its inhabitants have been given quite definite characteristics of their own. It is, in fact, the only country about which the author makes statements which differentiate it from other countries, the descriptions of which are for the most part conventional and monotonously alike. He tells us that it was 'de poco prez de armas,' so that its knights sought their fortunes in other lands—a characteristic not unknown in the modern Scot whether knightly or otherwise. Moreover, it was so poor that the king's own brother had no more than a single castle and was known as Galvanes sin Tierra, and in fact no country in mediæval Europe was poorer than Scotland. This Galvanes is one of the most clearly realised figures in the novel, one of the few who have a real personality and are not merely ideal figures. He was a confirmed bachelor up to middle age and cared nothing for women, and then suddenly astonished all those who knew him by falling violently in love with a lady and marrying her out of hand, thus exhibiting that very combination of hardness and sentimentality which is the traditional literary idea of the Scot. These facts, taken with what has already been said about the characters of Gandalfin and Mabilia, seem to hint at some special knowledge of the author with regard to Scotland and some special affection for her people.

(iii) *Bohemia*.

The main incident in respect to Bohemia is the attack on it by the Emperor of Rome successfully resisted with the help of Amadís. This may well be a reminiscence of actual fact. In 1278 Rudolf of Hapsburg, the Holy Roman Emperor, went to war with Ottokar of Bohemia to recover territory which the latter had filched from the Empire during its period of weakness in the Interregnum. Ottokar was in fact defeated and killed and the territory was recovered, but again in 1301 there was war between the two powers to prevent Bohemia from absorbing Hungary, and this time Rudolf's son Albert, who was now emperor, was unable to

make any impression on Bohemia, partly owing to the latter's treaty of alliance with France in 1303, and he was forced to retreat and to make peace. The episode in *Amadis* might be a confused recollection of these two events in which the motive of the former struggle was combined with the result of the latter.

(iv) *Romania.*

The Romania of *Amadis* is a country of a similar complexion socially to that of the others within which the novel moves, that is to say, it is feudal and governed by the laws of chivalry. Historically this is correct. During the thirteenth century, under the dynasties of De la Roche in Athens and Villehardouin in the Morea, it attained a position of great prosperity. It was governed by a code known as the 'Book of Customs of the Empire of Romania,' which was closely modelled on the famous Assises of Jerusalem, the most determined attempt ever made to put the full feudal theory into practice. The courts were wealthy and refined and constituted a school of chivalry to which knights came from all over Europe, and Guy, the Duke of Athens, held a tournament in Corinth in which a thousand knights took part. Relations with France were close—the excellence of the French spoken in Athens struck travellers from France—and Romania at that time was to France what the colonies and dependencies were to Britain in the nineteenth century, an ideal training ground and field of action for younger sons. By a curious freak of fortune most of the princes had few and weak sons but many strong daughters, so that the feminine element was important in Romania. Indeed, Isabelle de Villehardouin, heiress of the principality of the Morea and thrice married, once to the son of Charles of Anjou, King of Naples and Sicily, a second time in 1289 to Florent d'Avesnes of Hainault, and lastly in 1300 to Philip of the house of Savoy, might, in the twelve years when she was Queen of the Morea between the death of her first husband and her second marriage, have been the model from which Grímanesa was drawn.

(v) *Constantinople.*

The picture of Constantinople is, as we have seen, coloured by the traditions of the past, and the sense of actuality is not so strong in respect of it as of the other countries. But it occupies an important position in the novel, and this is a reflection of the part that it played in the political life of the west during the thirteenth century. Throughout the period of Latin dominance it was, of course, in effect part of the general system of

feudal states ruled by a dynasty which had intimate connexions with the west, so that intercourse between it and the other countries must have been frequent and knowledge of it common among the higher ranks of society. Even after it was recovered by the Greeks in 1261, it still occupied a large place in the thoughts of the west owing to the long drawn out negotiations for the union of the Eastern and the Western Churches with the constant interchange of embassies and the coming and going of negotiators. Simultaneously there were preparations for conquest by Charles of Anjou which were temporarily averted by the appeal of the Emperor Michael to St Louis, but were not finally stopped until the Sicilian Vespers made it impossible for Charles to think of foreign adventures. In the beginning of the next century they were renewed by another Charles, him of Valois, who, by marrying the granddaughter of the last Latin emperor, Baldwin II, inherited his claims to the Empire. These, it is true, came to nothing, but Constantinople must have been often on men's lips during the thirteenth century. So, although the idea of Constantinople in the *Amadis* may be a fanciful one, derived in part from previous literary sources, the fact that it is given a place of importance goes to show that the author belonged to a country which was aware of and took an interest in its affairs.

(vi) *Rome*.

Finally the difference between the romances and the *Amadis* in the treatment of Rome is marked. In the former Rome is still a formidable power, actual suzerain of Gaule and claimant to the suzerainty of Britain, against which and its French vassals Arthur has to fight a great and doubtful battle. In the latter Rome still claims to be great, though there is no question of suzerainty over either Gaule or Britain, but it is allied with Britain while Gaule, in the person of Amadís, is on the opposite side. The Romans, and especially their Emperor—always referred to by his nickname El Patín, the Gosling—are represented as being idle boasters who brag of their powers and of the mighty deeds they will do and who are consistently defeated by every opponent.

VI. DEDUCTIONS.

We have now seen the facts which must be taken into account in considering the question of the authorship of the *Amadis*, facts for which some explanation must be offered by any proposed answer to the question. Briefly stated they amount to this. The hero of the story is a Frenchman who goes to the court of England and there becomes the most famous

knight in the world, able to impose his will on the King of England and the Emperor of Rome combined. Some acquaintance is shown with the internal affairs of England and special knowledge of Scotland, Bohemia and Romania. Constantinople plays an important part, and, on the other hand, Rome is treated with contempt.

To these points may be added the nature of the work as a whole. It is the work of an artist; it is, indeed, as Menéndez y Pelayo says, the first modern novel with a definite plot, in which everything moves towards a predetermined end and the large and intricate series of characters and episodes is skilfully managed so as to enhance the glory of the principal figure. That figure is the picture of the perfect knight, the mirror of valour and of courtesy, who to the qualities of the epic hero adds a tenderness of heart, delicacy of feeling and kindly human nature which are essentially modern.

With these considerations in mind we have then to ask ourselves whether a work displaying these characteristics and treating of these matters, could have been produced in either Castile or Portugal in the first years of the fourteenth century. He would be rash who would deny that genius—and no other term is adequate to describe the author of the *Amadis*—may arise in unexpected surroundings, but the sober critic has to be guided by probabilities, and it is safe to assert that there is nothing in either Castilian or Portuguese prose literature until a much later epoch which would give grounds for supposing that such a work as the *Amadis* could have been produced in either country at that time. Of Castilian prose the examples are not very numerous, for it was in its infancy as an artistic medium, having been born in the latter part of Alfonso X's reign less than fifty years before the probable date of the *Amadis*. The chief works of that epoch which have survived are the *Crónicas* which, wonderful though they are, are of a different order altogether from the *Amadis*, and their most dramatic moments are not original but are derived from the prosification of epic poems; the *Caballero Cifar*, in which elements similar to some of those in the *Amadis* are found, but unco-ordinated, with the result that the work is a jumble far removed from the artistically arranged plot of the *Amadis*; Don Juan Manuel—though he is of slightly later date than the *Amadis*—who did for the eastern fable what the author of the *Amadis* did for the Arthurian romances, transformed them and made them into a new form of art with profound influence on all subsequent literature; yet even he, great artist though he was, does not exhibit that skill in construction and ability to handle a mass of material which is so conspicuous a feature of the *Amadis*. For the rest, Castilian

prose literature of the time consisted mainly of translations of the very Arthurian romances on which the *Amadis* was founded, or the *Gran Conquista de Ultramar*, which is undoubtedly a translation from the French, although the original has been lost. Portuguese prose was in a still more undeveloped state and offers fewer works which could afford even the most slender basis for supposing that the *Amadis* might have sprung from the literary circles which produced them.

Even granting the possibility that an author capable of writing the *Amadis* might have existed in conditions so apparently unlikely to have given him birth, there are further difficulties to solve. Why is the hero a Frenchman and why does he establish close connexions with certain countries in Europe rather than with others? It would be an exaggeration to say that literature is a reflection of the political and social conditions in which it is produced, but it is certainly reasonable to expect that these will have some influence at least on the content of literature, will determine to a certain extent the selection of topics to be dealt with. If this is so, and if the authorship of a book is in dispute between two countries, and if it can be shown that one of them has a special interest in some of the subject-matter while the other has not, then the claims of the former are by so much strengthened.

As regards the first point, the nationality of the hero, it is obvious that the author, while taking much of his material from the Arthurian romances, had as his object the creation of a new background and a new set of characters which should at the same time fit in with the general scheme of the romances. In these circumstances, being unhampered in his choice of hero, it would have been easy to make the protagonist a Spanish or a Portuguese knight, and that surely would have been more natural if the work were an original production of either of these countries. It is indeed on this hypothesis exceedingly difficult to explain why the only reference to Spain in the first three books is the mere mention of the fact that one comparatively unimportant knight, Brian de Monjaste, was the son of Ladasan, King of Spain. Nor can the difficulty be surmounted by saying that there was any tradition from the romances that French knights should take a prominent part, for they certainly do not—Lancelot does not come from Gaule but from Little Britain.

As regards the second point, the choice of countries beyond France and Britain, why should a Peninsular author who ordinarily sticks close to his originals in the matter of episodes choose as the scenes of new ones Bohemia, Rumania and Constantinople, and why should he show acquaintance with the internal affairs of England and a special interest in

and knowledge of Scotland? What connexion was there between any of these countries and either Castile or Portugal? There is nothing in the literature that has survived to show that Castilians or Portuguese were so much as aware of the existence of such countries as Scotland or Bohemia, which had not at that time done anything to make themselves widely known in foreign countries or to provide themes for literature; they were, in fact, quite obscure lands about which writers in France or Spain would not be likely to acquaint themselves unless they had some special reason for doing so, and that reason certainly did not exist in Spain. Nor was Spain interested in Romania until after the battle of the Cephissus in 1311, when the Catalan Grand Company became masters of it; but, in so doing, they destroyed those very conditions of chivalrous existence of which we have seen reminiscences in the *Amadís*, so that any account of Romania which may have filtered through to Spain as a result of the conquest would hardly have been such as to produce the picture given in the *Amadís*. Some knowledge of and even connexion with Constantinople had long existed in Spain, but it was not of such a nature as to make it probable that a Spanish author would assign to it a conspicuous rôle in a work of fiction. Castile had, indeed, emerged from the isolation in which it had lived during the days of the greatness of the Andalusian Caliphate, and since the beginning of the twelfth century had re-entered the circle of European culture. But it was still only on the fringe, and its relations were mainly with France and England. Alfonso X's excursion into world politics with his claim to election as emperor was very brief and never excited any interest in his own country, which was far more concerned with dynastic difficulties than with the affairs of regions so remote both geographically and spiritually. A Castilian author might possibly have made his Amadís visit Suabia, the home of Alfonso's mother, but Bohemia is hardly likely to have interested him.

If, on the other hand, the *Amadís* was the work of a French author, these points find a reasonable explanation. French prose as a medium for artistic expression had been in existence for nearly two hundred years before the probable date of the *Amadís* and had produced many works in a variety of styles. From a series of writers capable of producing *Aucassin et Nicolette*, the prose Byzantine novels, the history of Villehardouin, the memoirs of Joinville and, above all as nearest in subject-matter to the *Amadís*, the prose versions of the Arthurian romances, the rise of one adequate to the composition of the *Amadís* is certainly more probable than it would have been in Castile or Portugal. It is, however, when we come to consider the introduction of the episodes dealing with

countries outside the range of those in the Arthurian romances—so difficult of explanation on the hypothesis of a Peninsular author—that the case for a French original becomes strongest. It must be remembered that in the thirteenth century prose literature, and more particularly long romances such as the *Amadis*, can have circulated only in a comparatively limited sphere and one which was fairly closely connected with the court and fully aware of the political events of the day. It need, therefore, cause no surprise that an author should weave into his story—under a fanciful disguise, no doubt—something of what was attracting the attention and exciting the interest of the bulk of his readers.

When we look at the political situation of France at the beginning of the fourteenth century, we find that precisely those countries which appear for the first time in this class of literature, or at any rate appear as something clearly realised and not merely as names, have either recently entered for the first time into close relations with France or are objects of special interest to that country. In 1295 Scotland made the first of those alliances with France which were productive of so many results, good and bad alike, to both countries and to England as well. In 1303 for the first time Bohemia called in France as an ally against the emperor with, as we have seen, as successful results as those which followed from *Amadis'* assistance to Tafnôr. This alliance was continued and made closer when John, son of Henry of Luxembourg, became King of Bohemia in 1310, so much so that John became almost French, spent much of his time in Paris and renamed his son Wenceslas Charles after Charles IV of France, who in turn married John's sister Marie in 1322. Rumania, as we have seen, was almost a French dependency to which younger sons of nobles went to carve out a career for themselves and whose heiresses married French nobles, and interest in Constantinople was great in France at the time when, in 1301, Philip IV's brother Charles of Valois married the granddaughter of the last Latin emperor and set about raising an expedition to claim his wife's inheritance.

The grouping of powers in the *Amadis* is strangely reminiscent of the actual state of affairs in the beginning of the fourteenth century. On the one side, it will be remembered, were Lisuarte and El Patín, and on the other *Amadis*, representing France, supported by contingents from Scotland, Bohemia, Rumania and Constantinople. As a historical fact Edward I of England allied himself with the Roman emperor in 1294 against France, which replied by making alliances with Scotland and Bohemia; Rumania and Constantinople did not actually come into the question, but, as we have seen, they both had a close connexion with

France. We have also observed the new element of contempt for the Empire which appears in the *Amadis*, and this would be more natural in a French than in a Spanish author, for during the entire reign of Philip IV (1285-1314) France gained continual advantages over the Empire and secured for herself much territory hitherto in dispute between them. Surely it would be straining coincidence too far to suppose that a writer in the Peninsula who had no particular reason for selecting one country rather than another should have chosen precisely those, two of them at least quite unimportant in themselves, in which France was peculiarly interested at the time, and should have represented them as being in the same relationships with France as they occupied in reality.

VII. CONCLUSION.

The conclusion we reach, then, is that on grounds of (i) style, (ii) acquaintance with foreign countries, (iii) political grouping, it is much more probable that the *Amadis* originated in France than in either Castile or Portugal. On the assumption of French authorship the genesis of the novel seems to admit of a reasonable explanation. In the Arthurian romances Gaule occupies a subordinate and by no means glorious position as vassal of Rome and defeated by Arthur, nor do any of her knights shine at the Round Table, for Lancelot comes from Little Britain and in any case hovers on the edge of fairyland with his mysterious guardian, the Lady of the Lake. That was of no great importance so long as France was merely a geographical region with no political unity, occupied by dukes as powerful as the king. But, by the time of Philip IV, France was conscious of herself as a nation, and it was no longer fitting that in her most popular literature she should continue to be relegated to an inferior position. Something must be done to exhibit her in a more favourable light. Obviously it was impossible to tamper with the general disposition of the Arthurian romances in order to assign to her a more prominent rôle, and hence the device of creating a rival court to that of Arthur, an earlier and greater one, more powerful, more splendid, with more far-flung connexions, though essentially on the same lines, in which the first place would be held by a French knight and in which the contemporary friends and enemies of France would appear, to the triumph of the one and the defeat of the other. It is true that the actual defeat occurs in the fourth book generally attributed to Montalvo himself; but it is quite possible that at least an outline of the events therein related might have formed part of the original novel, for the carrying off of Oriana at the end

of the third book seems an unsatisfactory conclusion. Be that as it may, the triumph of France is clearly implicit in the third book.

Some such hypothesis, it seems to me, accounts far more satisfactorily for all the factors in the case than does that of Spanish or Portuguese authorship, so that perhaps the Seigneur des Essarts' wild assertion had more basis than he himself could have had any reason to suppose. That no trace of the French original remains need cause no surprise as both the *Gran Conquista de Ultramar* and *Enrique Fi de Oliva*, almost as popular in their day and as bulky, are admittedly translations from French originals which no longer exist. That a book so enormously popular and influential in its Spanish guise should have been entirely neglected in the country of its origin until re-translated from the Spanish is a curious freak of fortune. Perhaps, however, it may be explained by saying that the Arthurian vogue had had its day in France and that a national champion already existed in the person of Charlemagne, so that the attempt to create an artificial hero failed. But in the country of its adoption, where it arrived almost simultaneously with the first translations of the Arthurian romances, it held its own with these until, in a strange late flowering, it blossomed into something which captivated an entire world and influenced society in a manner in which few other single books have done. And by an ironical metamorphosis he who was designed to uphold the prestige of France among the alien knights of Great Britain, became to the Spaniards a representative of that Gales which now formed an integral part of England and hence the typical figure of the Englishman of romance.

A. K. JAMESON.

LITTLE MARLOW, BUCKS.

BOCCACCIO'S TITLES AND THE MEANING OF 'CORBACCIO'

THE word *Corbaccio*, the title of one of Boccaccio's minor works, has for several centuries defied investigation, and still remains a mystery. Presented in the form of a vision, the work comprises a diatribe against women and an attack on one woman in particular, the young Florentine widow who in the year 1354 rejected Boccaccio's advances, turned his middle-aged gallantry into ridicule and made him the laughing stock of the town.

Though at first sight the work seems to represent solely a vindictive lashing out of wounded vanity, in reality it is of more vital import than a mere piece of revenge. On the contrary, it reveals Boccaccio in a moment of self-reproach and condemnation, at a time of spiritual conflict, when his better nature, full of shame at the untoward turn of events, was taking stern resolves to dominate the flesh and live for higher things. The work represents his farewell to lusty youth, his good-bye to young men's follies.

Yet, at first glance, the title *Corbaccio* reveals nothing of this intimate struggle. Hitherto the word has been interpreted as coming from *corbo* or *corvo*, 'the crow or raven,' combined with the pejorative *-accio*: the whole resulting as the 'evil crow' or the 'croaking raven.' But whether the rapacious bird be symbolic of Boccaccio himself or of the chief object of his invective, the widow, is a nicety to be settled according to individual taste. Neither evil crow nor croaking raven has any real bearing upon the work. The text contains only one reference of the kind. 'Black swans and white ravens shall appear on earth ere men have just cause to give honour to women.' This reference is in itself a sure indication that the reader must look farther afield for an interpretation of the title.

Alternatively it has been suggested that the title is derived from *corba*, Latin *corbis*, 'a basket or trap'; and that it is connected with *corbellare*, 'to ridicule or mock.' But again the precise nature of the connexion is not easy to discern.

Some critics have pointed out the Turkish word *korbach*, allied to the Spanish *corbacho* and the French *courbache* in the sense of 'whip'; but there is no proof that Boccaccio knew the Turkish word, nor is it easy to understand how the word, if current in his time, could have disappeared

from Italian ever after. Moreover the title 'whip' does not tally with the chief purpose of the work.

Other critics, more ingenious, have dismissed the title *Corbaccio* in one efficacious phrase. 'Without doubt,' they say, 'it is an ambiguous expression and has a second obscene meaning.' I freely admit the advisability of letting sleeping dogs lie. But I cannot help recalling in this connexion a delightful scene in Dickens, where a certain illiterate Silas Wegg rashly professed a limitless intimacy with the 'Decline and Fall of the Rooshan Empire,' and, to his great dismay, found himself confronted instead with the 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.' When bidden to explain the difference he replied, nothing daunted: 'The difference, sir? There you place me in a difficulty, Mr Boffin. Suffice it to observe that the difference is best postponed to some other occasion when Mrs Boffin does not honour us with her company. In Mrs Boffin's presence, sir, we had better drop it.' Is it possible that the same manly delicacy has been at work in this matter of the *Corbaccio*, and that a similar chivalrous drawing of a veil has taken place?

However that may be, I venture to suggest that the explanation of the title *Corbaccio* can be arrived at with perfect propriety, in two ways. First, by a study of Boccaccio's customs in forming his titles, and secondly by reference to the work itself.

Boccaccio's titles and names are of three kinds. There are first those which are straightforwardly Italian, such as *Amorosa Visione*, *Ninfale Fiesolano*, *Fiammetta*. The second group comprises more particularly names, especially of characters in the *Filocolo*, and is characterised by the use of the anagram. Thus Gannai, which probably stands for Gianna or Jeanne, Garamirta for Margarita, Annavoi for Iovanna, Alleiram for Mariella, Airam for Maria, Asenga for Agnesa. These reveal a delightful aspect of Boccaccio's mind, and show him juggling with letters, inventively producing a puzzle for his readers, tantalising them by withholding the key, for not all the names have yielded easily to interpretation. This same love of anagram and word puzzles is displayed in the *Amorosa Visione*, where the series of initial letters of each *terzina* can be strung together to compose two sonnets and a ballata. In the first sonnet there is the dedication of the work to Madonna Maria or Fiammetta, and the last three lines of the sonnet tell that the author is Giovanni di Boccaccio da Certaldo. It seems likely that the same mental composition which delighted in anagrams and acrostics explains also Boccaccio's love of allegory and autobiographical episodes. Finally, the third group comprises those names and titles which are derived from one

or more Greek words, revealing incidentally an interesting aspect of Boccaccio's scholarship. His knowledge of Greek was not good: it was limited and inaccurate. 'The little dog does not dance very well,' objected the lady, whereupon Dr Johnson retorted that the wonder was that it danced at all. So with Boccaccio's store of Greek: the wonder is that he had any.

Above all is his fervent love of Greek remarkable in an age when such study was well-nigh unknown. Petrarch in his *Epistle to Homer* laments that on Arno's banks there were but three learned men who could read Homer, in Bologna one, in Verona two, in Mantua one, and in Rome, the centre of civilisation, none. In such an age Boccaccio's struggle to acquire Greek and his efforts to become acquainted with the *Iliad* have something of heroic proportions.

He was the first of modern humanists, it has been said, to introduce Greek quotations in any work of erudition. He was the first to cause to be translated into Latin both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, a mighty achievement which cost him much labour and vexation, for it was carried out through the medium of a surly and idle Calabrian, one Leontius Pilatus, a man of repellent appearance and uncouth manners. Yet such was Boccaccio's love of Greek and his yearning to unlock the closed book of Greek poetry that he endured this man's presence in his house for the space of three years, with unremitting patience urged him constantly to the work of translating until finally he completed his Homeric task.

He was fully conscious of the singular importance of his pioneer work. 'Nobody now knows Greek,' he states in his *Genealogia Deorum Gentilium*, 'and I am sorry for the Latin world, for it has so neglected the study of Greek that we do not even know the characters.... Not even the ancient writers of the Latin world have exhausted all the good that Greece has to offer: much still remains, much that we could still learn to our own great profit.' It is his own peculiar boast, he adds, to have revived the study of Greek in Tuscany.

Was it not I who turned aside Leontius Pilatus from Venice, whence after his long voyaging he intended to journey to the western Babylon, and succeeded in bringing him to Florence? Did I not receive him into my own house...and long give him hospitality there? Was it not I who with great difficulty procured his entry amongst the professors of Florence, and secured for him the post of Reader at the public expense? In very truth it was I, and I was the first to bring back the books of Homer and others of the Greeks into Tuscany whence they had departed these many centuries, never to return till now. And not only into Tuscany did I bring them back, but into my own city. I was the first to hear the *Iliad* privately from Leontius, and it was I who brought it about that the works of Homer should be read in public: and though I have not a vast acquaintance with the Greek language, yet I have laboured at it with all my might, and there is no doubt that, if that wanderer had dwelt longer in our midst, I should have known it better.

This passage was written probably after 1363 towards the close of his life, when he had already spent years on the study of Greek. Nevertheless his love of the language is no less clearly revealed in his youth, when he had had as yet few opportunities of study. His early works are full of names derived from Greek words, and some of his titles are names thus compounded.

Filocolo, the title of what is almost certainly his first prose work, is a word composed, he tells us in Book iv, of two Greek words and means. *atica d'amore*, 'toils of love.' '*Philos* in Greek,' he says, 'means *amatore* (lover), and *colos* means *fatica* (or toil). Thus joining them together and transposing the parts, there results *fatica d'amore*.' His explanation reveals the extent and the limitations of his knowledge at this stage. Firstly he either mistook the π of $\kappa\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma$, 'toil,' for a λ , or else misunderstood the word $\chi\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, 'hatred or wrath.' Secondly he distorted and misapplied the word $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$. Yet with his explanation as a guide the word *Filocolo* is at least intelligible.

Filostrato, probably his next work, is equally in need of the author's comment, and the meaning of the word is to be found in a rubric in one only of the seven Riccardi manuscripts, a rubric which does not form part of the Proem as it is sometimes printed. The title expresses the woes of love, and is derived from $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and *stratus* (rather than $\sigma\tau\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$); its meaning according to the rubric is 'the man conquered and cast down by love.'

Ameto, a work of the Florentine period, is derived from $\alpha\delta\mu\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$, 'the untamed or wild man,' and is one of the rare cases of simple derivation. It shows clearly that Boccaccio's chief concern is to produce a convincing Italianised form of the original, regardless of the fact that all the Greek characters are not represented.

Decameron, as is well known, is also composed from two Greek words, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha$, 'ten' and $\eta\acute{\mu}\epsilon\rho\alpha$, 'day,' again by a purely arbitrary combination. Raina has pointed out that the resultant form *Decameron*, rather than *Dechemeron*, may owe something to the influence of the Basilian *Hexhemeron*, currently entitled the *Hexameron* probably through a misconception of the Greek word for 'day.' Giovanni da Genova in his *Catholicon* explained that '*Hexameron* componitur ab *hexa*, quod est *sex*, et *meros*, quod est *dies*. Inde *Hexameron*, id est liber sex dierum.'

Certain names likewise occurring in Boccaccio's works are composed of two Greek words, or of one Greek and one Latin word. *Eucomos* of the *Filocolo* is easily identified as derived from $\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\text{-}\kappa\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$, 'the thick-haired.' *Ircuscomos* likewise from *hircus*, 'goat' and $\kappa\acute{o}\mu\eta$, 'the shaggy-haired.'

The accepted interpretation of the name *Idalagos* is not, I venture to suggest, entirely satisfactory. It will be remembered that *Idalagos* is a character in the *Filocolo* representing, in certain aspects, Boccaccio himself. This *Idalagos* first makes his appearance in Book VII of the *Filocolo*, not in human shape but as a tree, a tall pine. This pine chances to be pierced by an arrow shot from the bow of Florio, and a piece of bark is torn away from its trunk 'from which came forth blood, and a sorrowful voice, not otherwise than when Aeneas broke a bough from unrecognised Polydorus upon the sandy shore.' The tree, like its Virgilian prototype, 'sighs through the crimson wound and the sighing distils words' in which *Idalagos* tells his life story: how betrayed by his love, he was compassionately metamorphosed by Venus into this tall pine.

Crescini interprets the name *Idalagos* as coming from Ἰδα, the Doric form of the Ionic Ἰδη, referring to Mount Ida in Crete and Phrygia, in the sense of 'woody mountain,' or 'woods,' while λαγώς is used in the ordinary sense of 'hare.' Thus *Idalagos* results as 'hare of the woods,' or 'dweller in the woods.' In my opinion this interpretation is not consonant with the character of *Idalagos*, for, even stretching a point to read 'dweller in the woods,' as equivalent to 'hare of the woods,' the exact relation of that appellation to the whole episode is still far to seek.

I note, moreover, that there exists in the early manuscripts another form *Idalagos*, which may well have a direct bearing upon the text. I would derive the first word from ἰδός, 'sweat,' cognate with ἰδίω, 'to sweat,' and ἰδρώς, 'sweat,' the term used also for the sweating of trees, the exudation of resin or gum. Thus Ἰδα by analogy with ἰδάλιμος, 'causing sweat,' would combine with λόγος to produce a compound, meaning 'sweating words,' which is precisely the function of this particular pine-tree. The tree 'sighs through the crimson wound and the sighing distils words.'

The name *Panfilo*, used in the *Fiammetta*, the *Decameron* and the fifth *Eclogue*, is worthy of mention, for Boccaccio himself gives its meaning. In his letter to Fra Martino da Signa he explains that in Greek it means 'all love.'

Dioneo is used in the *Ameto* and in the *Decameron*, and means 'the licentious one.' In the *Ameto* most of the nymphs impersonate some virtue whose name they bear, and their loves likewise represent the contrary sin. So *Dioneo*, the licentious one, is loved by *Adiona*, the chaste nymph.

The three ways in which Boccaccio constructs his names and titles are clearly distinguishable. Yet the text alone can fairly decide to which

group each name belongs. Thus Clonico, in the *Filocolo*, can be interpreted as an anagram for Niccolò, and the character might be identified with Boccaccio's friend Niccolò degli Acciaiuoli. So, too, Ibrida yields an interpretation of Bardi. But I see no reason for believing that Boccaccio has used that name to show a kinship with the famous banking family of the Bardi for whom his father worked. On the contrary, I believe the anagram to be purely fortuitous, and that the name Ibrida is used in its simple Italian form, indicative of the mixed descent of Boccaccio from a French mother and an Italian father.

Turning now to the *Corbaccio*, the title has no satisfactory meaning as a purely Italian word. Nor does it admit of investigation for an anagram. It would, of course, produce Borcaccio, which would be only nonsensical, and would add nothing to our understanding of the work, even if we were to admit it as a corrupt form of the author's name. The final test is to consider whether the word can be of Greek derivation.

Early copyists bestowed different sub-titles upon the work: *Satire*, or the *Remedy for Love*. Others named it the *Labyrinth of Love*, and it has been assumed that such a sub-title was derived solely from the text of the work, proving, some say, that the early copyists did not understand the word *Corbaccio* any better than we do. I believe, however, such an assumption to be erroneous, and that they did, on the contrary, understand the word. It is true that the *Labyrinth of Love* as a title is not only perfectly in keeping with the subject-matter, but occurs several times in the text.

Boccaccio describes how in a dream he finds himself wandering along a pleasant path in a flowery region, and how, unexpectedly, the character of the smiling place changes, and it becomes a desert, stony waste, choked with nettles, thistles and rue, where all trace of his path is lost in the thick fog which envelops him.

This desert tract is enclosed by rugged, unscalable mountains, and all around can be heard the howling and roaring of many wild beasts. He gives himself up for lost, when at last he distinguishes a form coming to meet him, clad in scarlet. This is a spirit, the former husband of the widow who has rejected his advances, and Boccaccio learns from him that the region is called diversely by the names of the 'Labyrinth of Love,' the 'Enchanted Valley,' 'Venus's Pig-sty,' and the 'Valley of Sighs and Woe.' The entrance to this region is free to all who wish to come there with lasciviousness and folly, but the going out is a hard task only to be accomplished by dint of fortitude and stern reasoning.

Boccaccio asks the spirit a question:

In this wretched valley, which you name in divers ways without affixing to it any one name, does there dwell any being other than those whom perchance Love has driven from his Court and sent into exile, even as I think he has exiled me: or is it owned only by the wild beasts which I have heard roaring throughout the night?

Then the spirit smiles and replies:

Well do I know that the rays of the true light have not yet broken in upon your intellect, and that you consider supreme happiness that thing which is the bottom-most wretchedness, thinking even as many do, that there be some particle of good in your concupiscent and carnal love. Therefore hearken unto me and to what I shall now tell you. This wretched valley is that court which you call the Court of Love, and those wild beasts whose howling you have heard and still do hear, are the poor wretches—and you are one of them—ensnared by fallacious love: and their voices, when they speak of such love, sound in the ears of wise and high-minded men not otherwise than as they now reach your ears. Therefore I have called it a labyrinth, because in it men become entangled even as they did in that one of old, without hope of ever issuing forth.

No sooner does Boccaccio hear these words than a light breaks in upon him and he recognises the place, and 'why men have become wild beasts, and the meaning of the savage aspect of the region, and the gloomy names of the valley, and the reason why there is no track nor path.' He admits that he has been so entangled in the snares of love, and bemused by the passions as to be out of his mind: he then recounts the whole episode of the widow, and how she had vilely lured him into an act of indiscretion, only to make fun of him among her friends and point him out to them as her new admirer—a lovesick old fool, and so make him the talk of the town.

Then the spirit with wise counsel and careful reproof shows him his error. Here in this Labyrinth of Love, Boccaccio learns wisdom, puts off his folly and repents him of having loved and desired the young light-hearted widow. His cure is effected by the recital by her former husband of all her physical defects, evil customs and corruption. The 'Labyrinth of Love' is the setting for his cure, and the *Corbaccio* is Boccaccio's farewell to love of women.

The word *Corbaccio* does in fact correspond etymologically to 'Labyrinth of Love'; or more precisely it means the 'Region of those frenzied by passion.' I suggest that, following his usual custom, Boccaccio composed *Corbaccio* from two Greek words, *χώρα* or *χώρος*, meaning 'region' and *βάκχειος*, 'frenzied, passionate.'

Certainly he has taken a philological liberty in transforming *βάκχειος* into *-baccio*, with its soft 'c,' but the resultant form produces the more convincing Italian word and has far more attraction for the Italian ear. Such a handling of the hard and soft 'c' is for him perfectly natural, as in

the case of the name *Licida*, which he declares in his explanation of the eclogues to be derived from *lyco*, λύκος, 'a wolf.'

Then, again, Boccaccio's use of the word βᾱκχειος in the figurative sense of 'the frenzied with passion' is no more strained than Plato's use of it to express the 'frenzy of philosophy.' Thus *Corbaccio* is the Labyrinth of Love, or Region of the Passionate, and perhaps the early copyists were fully aware of this in their choice of the sub-title.

The solving of the problem presented by the word *Corbaccio* has its importance, for the right interpretation of the word makes it possible to distinguish the principal motive which actuated the composition. The work, therefore, should not be considered as a virulent invective dictated solely by desire for revenge. On the contrary, it is the didactic purpose which is paramount. A discourse on the 'Region of the Frenzied with Passion,' implying as it does the cure for love, sets the moral purpose in sharp relief and restores to its proper and secondary place the attack upon women. For the *Corbaccio* is in essence a reasoned and heartfelt act of penitence. Boccaccio begins the work by openly and fully confessing his fault: he ends by assigning to himself the composition of the work as the appropriate and necessary act of contrition and satisfaction. 'God alone who sees and understands the hearts of all men, knows whether I am sorrowful and repentant for the sin I have committed, whether I weep in my heart even as I do from my eyes.' He does but follow Christian teaching in turning from the cause of his sin, and in hating what he had formerly loved, when it led him into transgression.

Without pity for his own weaknesses Boccaccio reveals, in all its magnitude, the ignominy of the 'Court of Love' as he sees it, the dark abyss to which carnal sin surely leads. The gay devil-may-care youth of the *Decameron* was turning monk in his old age. He was offering to mankind, humbly and in chastened spirit, the bitter lesson he had learnt, and he was earnestly bidding youth take warning from his fall. Only in a spirit of self-abasement and true humility could he have laid bare so utterly his pathetic adventure. Yet he has been laughed at, sneered at for the undignified treatment he received at the hands of the widow, and for what was considered his puerile exhibition of temper. Without the didactic purpose the work would be comic: were revenge alone the ruling passion, he could be laughed at unreservedly. But the self-abasement is spontaneous, the humiliation is voluntary, the accents are overwhelmingly sincere. He is no child stamping his feet with rage because he cannot have what he wants: he is a grown man fighting the fierce enemy, the division in his soul. 'The grapes were sour,' Gasparry has pointed out:

but the old fox here has turned to the sterner task of rooting out from within himself a natural taste for grapes. When the moral purpose is given due recognition, the *Corbaccio* becomes a sublime illustration of the amazing pattern that the human mind weaves into life. Humility and revenge, the warp and the woof, ascetic aspirations and hurt vanity, religious fervour and obscenity. 'What a piece of work is man!'

The *Corbaccio* marks in Boccaccio the end of youth. His mind had remained in perfect equilibrium when as a young man he had been content to savour whole-heartedly earthly delights, and staunchly give the lie to the mediæval dictum that the body is the inferior and the enemy of the mind. Yet now when he was in the forties, and prematurely old, together with the physiological factor there came a compulsion of the spirit, and a call to asceticism. The young widow set the seal of sanctity upon the call by mortifying his vanity, and he believed that he had been tempted of the devil. The flesh had led him astray in bidding him enjoy a brief St Martin's summer. Fittingly was he served by being called a lovesick old goat, and by being bidden to 'go back and hoe his onion beds and leave gentlewomen alone.'

So the spiritual reaction was the more fierce in him, and his high resolves the more fervent. It was time to renounce the works of the flesh, and young men's follies, which were no longer seemly in a scholar with whitening hair. There must be no more singing and dancing and jousting, no more night wandering, disguising, and hiding under stairs, no more running after petticoats. And so he bursts out into the condemnation typical of the man who has either suffered beyond endurance through love or become satiated with it. 'Love,' he says, 'is a passion which blinds the spirit, leads astray the mind, robs a man of memory, dissipates his faculties, wastes his bodily strength: the enemy alike of youth and old age, a deadly generator of vices, a dweller in empty hearts, a thing devoid of reason, inordinate, unstable, a vice proper to unhealthy minds, an oversetter of human liberty.' Woman, consequently, is an instrument of the devil, and he expounds fully all her littleness and meanness. The Florentine widow becomes the butt of the fiercest satire, the quintessence of feminine failings: in his attack on her he out-Juvenal's Juvenal.

This same mood of savage reaction to his former joy in women evidently prevailed in him when he was writing parts of the *Life of Dante*, for reminiscences of the *Corbaccio* colour the famous passage dealing with Dante's marriage to Gemma Donati. How foolish were Dante's friends in urging him to take a wife! 'Yet,' Boccaccio adds, 'let no man think I

condemn marrying. On the contrary, I strongly recommend it, but not for all men. Let those who would be philosophers leave marrying to wealthy fools, to lords and labourers, but let them cleave to philosophy, a far fairer bride than any other.'

The same disposition of mind, with its phase of conflict, heaviness of soul, and confusion of aspirations, caused Boccaccio to lend an attentive ear to a certain friar, who visited him in the spring of 1362, bearing a message sent by one Pietro Petroni. This holy man upon his death-bed had seen a vision whereby Boccaccio, Petrarca and other eminent scholars were threatened with death if they did not at once renounce profane studies. Petrarca's comforting wisdom saved Boccaccio from the consequences of his panic, but his equanimity was sadly shaken, and his tortured conscience received fresh cause for terror at the ugly reminder of the nearness of death. It was but a short time afterwards that rumours were current in Florence that Boccaccio had decided to enter a monastery.

The call to asceticism was perhaps a normal reaction to a youth of enjoyment. His conversion had been preparing for some time, for many events between 1348 and 1354 must have contributed pressure. The plague with its horrors, his father's death, the death of his little daughter Violante, the loss of Fiammetta. Still more potent the example of his spiritually-minded friend Petrarca. But the actual crisis came with the incident of the *Corbaccio*, which is therefore far more than a trivial and shameful misadventure. It was one of those rare moments, whether of sorrow or of joy, which illumine a man's whole vision. The widow's rejection of his love was a hammer-blow, the heavier because it repeated and reawakened the pain of Fiammetta's forsaking him; the more stinging because he was fully aware that he was no longer young. Small wonder then that it decided the trend of his later years.

The *Corbaccio* reveals Boccaccio at the cross-roads. At this moment he decides to dedicate the rest of life to study and contemplation of higher things. He will leave women and talk instead with those fairer beings, the Muses, who will show him 'the causes of the changes in the seasons, the labours of the sun and of the moon, what hidden virtue nourishes trees, and makes brute beasts friendly together; whence souls enter in upon men, and how eternal and infinite is the divine goodness, and by what steps men climb to reach it and over what precipices they are hurled to the opposite depths.' Once convinced, himself, of the folly of yielding to the passions, Boccaccio is eager to convert all men to his view, and the book is offered to mankind, a confession and a warning.

It is true that the vindictive motive is but thinly veiled. His desire to

save the widow's soul alive by chastening her in the eyes of the world is a pious work which savours much of simple spite. Yet this is only secondary. His main purpose, and it is fully achieved, is to humble himself, to take himself sternly to task and warn others of the snares set in the Labyrinth of Love, the Region of the Frenzied with Passion. Wherefore at the end of the *Corbaccio* we leave him on a calmer, sweeter note than that of mere vengeance, we leave him resolved to live thenceforward secluded, in quietness, in contemplation and in study, striving for spiritual advancement and salvation. And so indeed he did from that day onwards, and the world of letters is the poorer, for the *Corbaccio* is his last creative work in the vulgar tongue. In the years which followed he gave us books of erudition, valuable and weighty, but who can say what work of art might not have sprung from his pen but for those noble, stern resolves to 'scorn delights and live laborious days'?

V. M. JEFFERY.

LONDON.

THE INFLUENCE OF VICTOR HUGO ON SPANISH DRAMA

THIS, the third and last of a series of articles on the influence of Victor Hugo in Spain¹, endeavours to assess the effect which Hugo's work had upon Spanish drama before 1845. This date is, as in the previous articles, to be taken only as approximate, our aim here being to deal with Hugo's influence during the so-called 'Romantic' period and not to touch the larger question of any inspiration, direct or indirect, which may have been drawn from him by the neo-Romantics of the latter half of the century.

I.

In dealing with the vogue of Victor Hugo in Spain², we have already shown how brief and how limited was the popularity of his plays. The enthusiasm of the Parnasillo³ for them was by no means indicative of the taste of the following generation; indeed, the pendulum of public approval swung only for a few years in favour of modern French drama at all, to turn markedly, at the beginning of the eclectic period, towards the Golden Age.

Nuestros jóvenes autores (wrote Mesonero Romanos in 1839) huyeron de presentar en la patria escena el espectáculo de crímenes atroces, de caracteres excepcionales e inverosímiles, de monstruos coronados, más o menos históricos, o ideales de verdugos sentimentales, de asesinos filósofos, de mujeres criminales y, sin embargo, de alma superior. No mancharon en general nuestra escena los Angelos y los Hernanis, las María Tudor y Lucrecia Borgia.... Algunos, muy contados, extravíos (he continued) produjo la fatal imitación de la novísima escuela romántica-francesa, que vinieron a empañar el halagueño cuadro que presentaba la nuestra: pero éstos, por su escaso valor literario, o lo antipático de su argumento para un público español, pasaron, como quien dice, desapercibidos, sin dejar rastro en pos de sí⁴.

Mesonero was not, of course, an entirely unbiased critic, but an examination of the dramas of the period in Spain leads on the whole to a confirmation of his judgment, which our first article has indeed already foreshadowed.

It cannot be stated too insistently that the precepts of the *Préface de Cromwell* were for the most part deducible from the dramas of Spain's Golden Age, and that any appeal which they might make in Spain would

¹ *Modern Language Review*, xxvii, 1932, pp. 36 ff., and xxviii, 1933, pp. 50 ff.

² *Ibid.*, xxvii, pp. 36-57.

³ 'En un negro y tenebroso café, que malas lenguas llamaban "El Parnasillo," leíamos a hurtadillas y en pepitoria los dramas de Victor Hugo' (Roca de Togores, *Obras poéticas*, Madrid, 1857, II, p. 277).

⁴ *Semanario Pintoresco*, 1839, pp. 154, 156.

be an appeal of familiarity and not of novelty. Hugo had other opinions, however, which were very far from finding a welcome in Spain. He was apt to attribute greater importance to the conception of his dramas and to the theories embodied in them than to characterisation or to purely dramatic qualities. Thus he writes in the preface to *Angelo* (1835):

Le théâtre est un lieu d'enseignement. Le drame...doit donner à la foule une philosophie, aux idées une formule, à la poésie des muscles, du sang et de la vie, à ceux qui pensent une explication désintéressée, aux âmes altérées un breuvage, aux plaies secrètes un baume, à chacun un conseil, à tous une loi.

Or again, in the preface to *Ruy Blas* (1838), Hugo's Romantic personification of the people ('quelque chose de grand, de sombre et d'inconnu') in the character of his hero, his definition and description of the 'sens historique' in the play and his symbolisation of the 'three sovereign forms of art' in *Don Salluste*, *Don César* and *Ruy Blas* are all traits for which a Spanish audience of the day would feel, at best, indifference, at worst a positive repugnance. It is natural, then, that those who imitated Hugo should confine themselves to taking characters and scenes from his plays rather than building dramas on his theories. Further, we cannot be surprised that the taste for imitating Hugo's dramas declined as surely as the taste for witnessing them when Spain's own Golden Age provided so excellent an alternative source of inspiration and one so sympathetic. Gonzalo Morón was probably echoing popular opinion when he wrote:

Sin desconocer el relevante mérito de algunos dramas franceses y las bellezas poéticas en que abundan, hemos reprobado y reprobaremos siempre su dominación en el teatro español, no tan sólo porque nos importan una moral, creencias y costumbres, que afortunadamente no son nuestras, sino porque tenemos fé en un teatro español¹.

In this period, then, Hugo's direct influence on Spanish drama will be found to have been as brief as the vogue of his plays on the Spanish stage. His indirect influence, however, through the effect of his work upon the popularity of historical drama, may well have been considerable. 'Il ne faut pas oublier,' writes M. le Gentil, 'que des œuvres comme *Hernani* ont servi à acclimater en Espagne le drame historique, riche de détails et de mouvements².' Here we seem to be going rather too far. M. le Gentil is a critic to whom all students of Spanish Romanticism are deeply indebted and for whose judgment we ourselves have the greatest respect. But, apart from the fact that many writers from other countries than France dealt in historical subjects and had a following in Spain, there was an influence in the direction of historical drama considerably stronger

¹ *Revista de España*, iv, 1843, p. 119.

² *Bulletin Hispanique*, i, p. 167.

than that of all of these writers combined: namely, the cumulative effect of the Romantic revival in Spain itself, which, when Hugo's influence began to make itself felt, had been progressing and gathering force for something like fifty years. Until some more definite evidence is forthcoming, then, we think that this question must be treated as an open one.

II.

We now come to consider Hugo's influence upon the principal dramatists of the period, first among whom may be placed Martínez de la Rosa. A comparison between this author's dramas written before and after his sojourn in France leaves no room for doubt that his impressionable character was strongly influenced by French Romanticism. In both periods he attempts historical drama, but in the interval his methods undergo a complete transformation. *Morayma* (1818) and *Aben-Humeya* (1830) are both historical dramas with a Moorish background: in the first, the characters might, but for their names, belong to any epoch and to any nation; in the second, it is impossible to mistake the country, the epoch or the race. A comparison of the preface to *Aben-Humeya* with the preface to *Cromwell* will suggest that this sudden addiction to local colour came from Hugo¹, just as to his 'Il y aura foule dans le drame' may probably be attributed the nature of Martínez de la Rosa's list of *dramatis personae*².

We are rather inclined to suspect the direct influence of the drama *Cromwell* (1827) upon *Aben-Humeya*, though the evidence for this is not conclusive. The general idea of the insecurity of kingship and the contrast between high estate and increasing danger are present in both plays, and in a few of the passages which convey these traits may be detected verbal similarities. Thus:

Cromwell! d'un côté le trône est abordable.

On y monte; et de l'autre on descend au tombeau.

(*Cromwell*, III, iv)

¡Aben-Abó! Mira, ¿ves este reguero de sangre? ¡Ese es el camino del trono!

(*Aben-Humeya*, III, xix)

¹ 'Il fallait tracer le tableau avec la plus grande fidélité possible sans rechercher néanmoins cette exactitude scrupuleuse qu'on exige dans une chronique mais en s'efforçant de graver sur l'ouvrage comme sur une médaille le cachet de l'époque et du pays' (*Aben-Humeya*, French version). 'Le drame doit être radicalement imprégné de cette couleur des temps; elle doit en quelque sorte y être dans l'air, de façon qu'on ne s'aperçoive qu'en y entrant et qu'en en sortant qu'on a changé de siècle et d'atmosphère' (*Préface de Cromwell*).

² After the named characters come: 'Una esclava vieja. Un pastorcillo. La viuda de un castellano. Moriscos sublevados, soldados castellanos. Gente del pueblo. Pastores y zagalas, Esclavos negros, Mujeres y esclavas al servicio de Zulema.' Cf. Mesonero Romanos' burlesque caste in his essay 'El Romanticismo y los Románticos.'

Or:

Pour moi ce palais sombre au sepulcre est pareil,
Dans ces longs corridors et dans ces vastes salles
Règnent les noirs frissons et les nuits glaciales.

(*Cromwell*, III, iii)

Lo único que no puedo sufrir es este castillo.—No sé qué tiene, tan triste y tan opaco, que me acongoja el alma.

(*Aben-Humeya*, III, ii)

The probability is that Martínez de la Rosa had *Cromwell* in mind when writing *Aben-Humeya*, but was not using it consciously. By the time he wrote *La Conjuración de Venecia* (1834) he seems to have shaken off such reminiscences. Describing himself, in the preface to this play, as 'caminando a tientas y sin guía,' he borrows nothing from Hugo directly, though some of the Romantic stock-in-trade which he takes over may originally have come from him. Looking at the history and temperament of Martínez de la Rosa, we may well be surprised that he did not make greater use of his French contemporary.

Larra, in the preface to his *Macías* (1834), was clearly sensitive to the comparisons which would be made between it and the dramas of Hugo and Dumas:

¿Es un débil destello siquiera de la colosal y desnuda escuela de Victor Hugo o Dumas? ¿Es un drama romántico? No sé qué punto de comparación puedan establecer los críticos entre *Antony*, *Lucrecia Borgia*, *Enrique III*, *Triboulet* y mi débil composición.

There are reminiscences in the play of Dumas' *Antony* and *Henri III et sa Cour*, but none of Hugo.

Bretón wrote two plays in which Hugo's influence might be looked for. He seems, however, to borrow nothing from him in his *Elena* (1834), unless it be the romantic bandits. The situations of his *Don Fernando el Emplazado* (1837), on the other hand, bear some relation to those of *Marion de Lorme*, a part of which play Bretón had translated in 1833. In each we have a king weary of his chief adviser. Louis XVI detests the power and rule of the Cardinal, as Ferdinand IV detests the power his uncle Enrique has over him and over Spain. On one occasion, when this hatred is very strongly felt, the king turns to a counsellor, asking his opinion. The lines in Bretón's play (III, i) beginning

¿Qué concepto te merece
Mi tío?

seem to have a more than fortuitous resemblance with the passage in *Marion de Lorme* (IV, vi), beginning:

Que pensez-vous de lui?

Doña Sancha is given the same problem to face as Marion—her honour or her lover; but, unlike Marion, she prefers that Don Pedro should die, rather than that, dishonoured, she should be disloyal to his love.

It was a commonplace of Spanish criticism in 1835 that the Duque de Rivas' *Don Álvaro* owed much to Victor Hugo, though a debt to the school, rather than to the man, was generally indicated¹. This appears to be a correct estimate. It is true that one episode in *Don Álvaro* (the hero's duel with Don Carlos just after duelling has been prohibited) recalls a similar incident in *Marion de Lorme*. And it is also true that Rivas' hero, growing up among barbarians², frowned on by fate³, driven relentlessly he knows not whither⁴ and speaking of himself as the devil's envoy⁵, more than once reminds us of Hernani, and this much more strongly than any one Romantic hero is apt to remind us of any other. Yet, in spite of these possible reminiscences, it can hardly be said that the play as a whole is inspired by Hugo, and in none of Rivas' other plays do we find any trace of Hugo's direct influence.

The influence of Hugo on García Gutiérrez having been discussed by Professor Nicholson B. Adams⁶, it will suffice here to add a few comments. Like Larra, García Gutiérrez was indebted to Dumas more seriously than

¹ Cf. Ochoa in *El Artista*, 1836, No. 15, Cueto in his 'Discurso necrológico literario en elogio del Duque de Rivas' (*Memorias de la Academia Española*, Madrid, 1870, II, pp. 498–601); Mesonero Romanos in the *Semanario Pintoresco*, 1842, p. 399. The last passage is a good example of the use of 'Victor Hugo' for 'French Romantic School': 'El Sr Saavedra... se afilió...bajo la bandera de Victor Hugo, y dominado por su ardiente fantasía, lanzó al teatro español el señalado drama titulado *Don Álvaro, o la fuerza del sino...*'

² Cf. 'Entre bárbaros crecí' (*Don Álvaro*, III, III) and 'Parmi ces montagnards, libres, pauvres et graves, je grandis' (*Hernani*, I, I).

³ Cf.

'Entonces risueño un día,
uno sólo, nada más
me dió el destino; quizás
con intención más impía.'

(*Don Álvaro*, III, III)

and 'Va, si jamais le ciel à mon sort qu'il renie
Souriait...n'y crois pas! ce serait ironie'

(*Hernani*, III, III)

⁴ Cf.

'Busco ansioso el morir
Por no osar el resistir
De los astros el furor.'

(*Don Álvaro*, III, III)

and 'Où vais-je? Je ne sais, mais je me sens poussé
D'un souffle impétueux, d'un destin insensé.'

(*Hernani*, III, IV)

⁵ Cf. 'Yo soy un enviado del infierno, soy el demonio exterminador.'

(*Don Álvaro*, V, II)

and

'Je suis une force qui va
Agent aveugle et sourd de mystères funèbres,
Une âme de malheur faite avec des ténèbres.'
'C'est un démon redoutable, te dis-je,
Que le mien.'

(*Hernani*, III, IV)

⁶ *The Romantic Dramas of García Gutiérrez*, New York, 1922.

to Hugo¹: *El Paje*, for example, is an imitation of Dumas' *Tour de Nesle*, which García Gutiérrez had also translated as *Margarita de Borgoña*. Further, many of the Romantic devices which we find both in his plays and in Hugo's can also be found in the plays of other French Romantics. Such devices are the use of antithesis in character-portrayal; provision of each act with a title (as in *Hernani* and *El Trovador*); the mistake-in-darkness motif (*El Trovador*, I, i; *Hernani*, II, II); and the killing of a relative without knowing his identity (*Lucrece Borgia*, *Le Roi s'amuse*, *El Trovador*).

Professor Adams finds the first scene of *El Trovador* 'strikingly like the first scene of Victor Hugo's *Lucrece Borgia*²'; the similarities seem to us about as close as those we have pointed out between *Aben-Humeya* and *Cromwell*. On the other hand, we believe the parallel which he cites between the last acts of *El Trovador* and *Marion de Lorme*³ to be entirely fortuitous: as Professor Adams himself admits, 'the circumstances are very different⁴.'

Hartzenbusch, less addicted to French drama than most of his Spanish contemporaries, appears to have taken nothing directly from Victor Hugo. A vague resemblance between the Zulema of the *Amantes de Teruel* and Hugo's *Lucrece Borgia* is the only avenue of influence that can be suggested. Blanco García⁵ says of *La Madre del Pelayo*: 'Recuerda de lejos a Yocasta y Mérope, y, aunque en situación menos trágica, a la *Lucrecia Borgia* de Victor Hugo.' The only point of resemblance, however, between the two is that both mothers, in seeking revenge, unknowingly demand the lives of their sons. There is no similarity between Doña Luz and Lucrecia Borgia themselves. The former, a virtuous woman, seeks to revenge the murder of her beloved husband, while Lucrecia's love of cruelty makes her demand the life of the man who has insulted her.

III.

We have now surveyed the work of the six principal Spanish writers whose dramas filled the foreground of the stage during those eventful years (1834-7) in which the Romantic Revolt enjoyed a brief success. It is clear that none of them thought it worth while to model his work as closely upon Hugo as, for example, Espronceda modelled his poetry on Lord Byron and his novel *Sancho Saldaña* upon Sir Walter Scott. Dumas, it would seem, was more generally drawn upon than Hugo by

¹ Blanco García (*La Literatura Española en el Siglo XIX*, Madrid, 1909, I, p. 224) describes him as 'obsessed by the French School, which kept him wavering between Dumas and Victor Hugo.' ² *Op. cit.*, p. 85. ³ *Op. cit.*, p. 87. ⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Op. cit.*, I, p. 244. Cf. p. 235 for a more general comparison.

these dramatists, and neither was used appreciably. We have referred in our earlier articles to Zorrilla's attitude to Hugo, and there seems nothing further to add to what was there said.

Two at least of the lesser Romantics, however, eked out their imagination with Hugo's, and not always ineffectively. The eclectic Gil y Zárate, whose *Carlos II el Hechizado* (1837) represents his chief concession to the new school, is the more notable of these. This play had a curiously mixed reception; it was described by one critic as 'uno de los mejores dramas representados en la escena española¹' and by another as 'escrito para rivalizar con las más exageradas obras de Victor Hugo y Alexandre Dumas²,' and the author's definite imitation of Hugo was noticed almost from the beginning:

En este drama, el Sr Gil y Zárate siguió en casi todo la malhadada escuela y perjudicial moral del autor de *Nuestra Señora de Paris*, hasta parecer a veces una imitación³.

The imitation is unmistakable, for the character of the confessor, Froilán Díaz, is taken from that of the archdeacon Claudio Frollo in Hugo's novel *Notre Dame de Paris*. Gil y Zárate has reproduced the character of Frollo as faithfully as the limited length of a drama permitted. In all outstanding points they are identical. Both are clerics, renowned for their extraordinary learning which they make the god of their lives. Each casts aside his learning, his science and all his ambitions in order to indulge his unrestrained passion for a young and beautiful gipsy girl. When they cannot attain their desires, both seek and find consolation in a terrible revenge, the death of the objects of their adoration. Inez, too, resembles Esmeralda in many ways. They are alike in the purity of the passion of each for her young lover, but while Esmeralda never shows anything but detestation and horror for Frollo, Inez, in spite of her intense hatred, shows pity for Froilán Díaz. Besides similarity in the characters there are also similarities of situation. Like Frollo, Froilán Díaz visits Inez in the prison and casts himself at her feet, passionately chewing the straw on the ground. As in the novel, Inez, when faced with death, turns for help and is confronted with Froilán, who asks her to choose between him and death. She chooses death⁴.

¹ *El Siglo XIX*, 1837, pp. 175-6.

² *Semanario Pintoresco*, 1837, p. 380.

³ *Revista de España*, 1842, II, p. 90.

⁴ Cf. Martínez Villergas (*Juricio Crítico*, p. 108): 'Su valor literario se reduce a la última expresión, no sólo porque la novela es buena y el drama muy malo, sino porque el susodicho drama está tomado de la mencionada novela.' 'Supongo que todos mis lectores conocerán la novela de Victor Hugo y recordarán aquellas terribles escenas de pasión en que el arcediano, enamorado de la gitana, la sigue, la declara su pensamiento, la somete al tribunal que la condena a muerte como hechicera, la propone la paz en el calabozo y por último la entrega al verdugo, viéndose rechazado y maldecido por ella. Pues bien, todo esto lo repite Fray Froilán Díaz contra una pobre muchacha llamada Inez en el *Carlos II*.'

Finally, Patricio de la Escosura describes his drama *La Corte del Buen Retiro* (1837) as an 'attempt to amalgamate the romanticism of Calderón with that of Dumas and Victor Hugo'.¹ The only definite imitation of Hugo, however, seems to be in the characters of the king and the buffoon, both of whom, and especially the latter, suggest personages in *Le Roi s'amuse*. Escosura's buffoon has the bodily deformity and ugliness of Triboulet, though not his paternal love or any other quality which redeems him. He wants the beautiful Queen Isabel for himself, and, in order to obtain her, is capable of any evil. Though there are no clear verbal resemblances, we believe this to be a case of definite influence

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF TRANSLATIONS INTO SPANISH OF THE
WORKS OF VICTOR HUGO PUBLISHED DURING THE THIRTY
YEARS 1834-63.

[Short titles have as a rule been given. Where no indication to the contrary appears in square brackets, we have not actually handled the edition and quote it on the authority of an advertisement, a review in a contemporary periodical, or a record in some bibliography. Abbreviations: B.M. = British Museum; B.Nac. = Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid; B.Mun. = Biblioteca Municipal, Madrid; B.S.I. = Biblioteca de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras (San Isidro), Madrid; B.Cat. = Institut d'Estudis Catalans, Barcelona; B.U. = University of Barcelona; Sev.U. = University of Seville; Val.U. = University of Valencia.

We have to acknowledge help given in the tracing of these items by D. Federico Ruiz Morcuende, of the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid; D. José Deleito y Piñuela, of the University of Valencia; D. Alfonso Par, of Barcelona; and Mr R. F. Brown, of the University of Liverpool.]

1. *El Último Día de un Reo de Muerte*. Traducido al castellano por D. José García de Villalta. Madrid, 1834. [B.Mun.] [See a review in *El Artista*, 1835, I, pp. 40-3, which discusses not only this translation but also the attitude of Spain to Romanticism in general.]
2. *Ángelo, Tirano de Padua*. Drama en tres actos escrito en francés por Mr Victor Hugo y traducido al castellano. Madrid, Imprenta de Repullés, 1835. [B.Nac.]
3. *Bug Jargal*. Traducido al castellano de la quinta edición francesa por D. Eugenio de Ochoa. Madrid, 1835. [B.Mun.]
4. *Han de Islandia*. Traducido al castellano de la cuarta edición francesa por D. Eugenio de Ochoa. Madrid, 1835. 2 vols. [B.Nac. catalogue: copy reported 'lost'; B.Mun.]

¹ Preface to *Don Jaime el Conquistador*.

5. *Hernani*. Traducido por Altes y Gurena. Barcelona, 1835. [This was in the Val.U. catalogue in 1923, but we are informed (February 1932) that the book is not in the library.]
6. *Lucrecia Borgia*. Drama en cinco actos escrito en francés por Victor Hugo. Traducido libremente al castellano por Don Ángel Cepeda. Representado por primera vez en el Teatro del Príncipe en 18 de julio de 1835. Madrid, Imprenta de Repullés, 1835. [B.Nac.]
7. *Bug Jargal*. Traducción con aclaraciones y notas. Paris, 1836-7. 3 vols.
8. *Hernani, o el Honor Castellano*. Drama en cinco actos, escrito en francés por el célebre Victor Hugo y traducido en verso castellano, en variedad de metros, por D. Eugenio de Ochoa. Madrid, Teatro del Príncipe, 24 de agosto de 1836. Madrid, Imprenta de Don José María Repullés, 1836. [Val.U.]
- 8 a. *Hernani, o el pundonor castellano*. Drama escrito en francés por Monsieur Victor Hugo, y traducido en verso castellano por D. Agustín Zárraga y Heredia. Habana, Imprenta de D. José María Palmer, 1836. [Val.U.] [Though not published in Spain, this edition is included for the sake of completeness.]
9. *Nuestra Señora de París*. Traducida al castellano de la octava edición francesa por D. Eugenio de Ochoa. Madrid, Tomás Jordán, 1836. 3 vols. [B.Mun. Also B.Nac. catalogue (one volume only and copy reported 'lost'). Cf. *El Herald*, July 19, 1840: 'Español puro y castizo.' 'Enriquecido con notas que hacen comprensibles al lector las páginas más difíciles de aquel libro.']
10. *Jamberto Gallers (Horas de Invierno)*. Gozlan, Federico Soulié, Victor Hugo, Addison, Washington Irving, Hoffman, La Duquesa de Abrantes, Alejandro Dumas, Walter Scott, Alfonso Brot, Julio Janin, Trueba, Alfonso Royer, Balzac y Eugenio de Ochoa. Madrid, Imprenta de I. Sancha, 1836. [B.Nac. The story (p. 259) is entitled *Imberto Galloix* and is No. 20 of the series.]
11. *María Tudor*. Drama en tres jornadas, original de Victor Hugo, traducido por D. José González de Velasco. Representado en el teatro de esta capital a beneficio de Doña Concepción Samaniego, el jueves 26 de enero de 1837. Valencia, Imprenta de D. Ildefonso Mompié de Montagudo, 1837. [B.Nac., Val.U.]
12. *Nuestra Señora de París*. Burdeos, 1838. 5 vols. [An abridged edition; cf. note to No. 17 a.]

214 *The Influence of Victor Hugo on Spanish Drama*

13. *El Rey se divierte*. Drama en cuatro actos de Victor Hugo, arreglado al teatro español por D. Ventura de la Vega. Madrid, Imprenta de los hijos de Doña Catalina Piñuela, **1838**. [B.Nac., B.S.I., Val.U.]
14. *El Rey se divierte*. Traducción del drama que con este título escribió en verso francés el célebre Victor Hugo. Barcelona, **1838**.
15. *María de Inglaterra*. Drama en tres jornadas de Victor Hugo. Traducido por D. Jacobo de la Pezuela. Madrid, **1839**. [Val.U.]
- 15 a. *María Tudor*. Drama. Montevideo, **1840**.
16. *Bug-Jargal o El Negro Rey*. Por Victor Hugo. Traducido al español por D. M. Bosch. Barcelona, Imprenta de D. Manuel Sauri, **1840**. [B.Nac.]
17. *El Último Día de un Reo de Muerte*. Madrid, **1840**.
- 17 a. *Nuestra Señora de París*. 'Consta de 3 tomos en 16º mayor, láminas, a 26 rs. rústica y 33 pasta. Se hallará en la librería de Francisco Oliva, Calle de Platería, número 8.' (*El Constitucional*, February 17, **1840**.) [We have not found any copy of this edition, but *El Heraldo* for July 19, 1840, says: 'No es más que una edición española de la versión que se publicó en Burdeos'—i.e. No. 12, above—'desmembrada de sus mejores capítulos.' 'El lenguaje ni es exacto, ni propio, ni castizo.' 'Hállanse...nombres extravagantes.. términos que no son castellanos, ni jamás lo han sido; y por último el estilo es muy desigual y se aparta frecuentemente del que sigue el autor.' The tone of the review, it is true, suggests that its author was somewhat prejudiced against either Oliva or the Bordeaux editor.]
18. *Ángelo, Tirano de Padua*. Drama en tres jornadas, escrito en francés por M. Victor Hugo, y traducido al castellano. 2ª edición, Madrid, Imprenta de Repullés, **1841**. [B.S.I. For a critique of the play when first given in Spanish, see *Revista Española*, 1835, II, pp. 715, 743.]
19. *Bug Jargal o el Negro Rey*. Traducido al español por D. M. Bosch. Barcelona, **1841**.
20. *Lucrecia Borgia*. Drama en 5 actos, escrito en francés por Victor Hugo, traducido libremente al castellano por D. Ángel Cepeda. 2ª edición. Madrid, Imprenta de Repullés, **1841**. [B.S.I.] [For critiques and reviews of this play in Spanish see *La Abeja*, 1835, I, pp. 443, 448; *El Artista*, 1835, II, pp. 34-5, 47; and *Revista Española*, 1835, II, pp. 560, 565, 569, 593.]
21. *Nuestra Señora de París*. Traducido por D. Eugenio de Ochoa, Barcelona, **1841**. 4 vols. [B.Nac.] [Second edition of No. 9.]

- 21 a. El Último Día de un Reo de Muerte. Por Victor Hugo. Adornada con una lámina. Segunda edición. Barcelona, Imprenta de D. Manuel Sauri, 1841.
22. Obras escogidas de Victor Hugo. Nuestra Señora de París. Also: Han d'Islandia o el hombre fiera. This appears to be No. 23 below. Barcelona, 1842. 4 vols.
23. Han de Islandia o el hombre fiera. Romance histórico del siglo XVII, por el célebre Victor Hugo, y traducido nuevamente al castellano por D. J. de O. y V. Barcelona, 1842. 2 vols.
24. Ángelo, Tirano de Padua. Barcelona, 1843.
25. Ruy Blas. Traducción castellana. Barcelona, 1844. [On *Ruy Blas*, cf. *El Panorama*, 1838, II, p. 144.]
26. Diario de las ideas y opiniones de un revolucionario de 1830, por Victor Hugo. Traducido por Luis Cuchet. Barcelona, 1846. [B.Cat., B.U., Sev.U.]
27. Nuestra Señora de París. Madrid, Gaspar, 1846. 2 vols. Reprinted 1847, 1850.
28. Pugny. La Esmeralda. Gran baile dramático en tres actos...sacado de la célebre novela de Victor Hugo, Nuestra Señora de París. Composición de M. Perrot. Barcelona. T. Gorchs, 1849. [B.Cat.]
29. Nuestra Señora de París. Traducida por D. Eduardo Chao. Madrid, 1850.
30. María de Inglaterra, 1852. [Val.U. catalogue. Copy could not be found in February 1932.]
31. Napoleón el Pequeño. Por Victor Hugo. Londres, Jeffs, librero-editor, 1852. (An anonymous translation.) [B.Nac., B.S.I.]
32. El Han d'Islandia. Madrid, 1853.
33. Han d'Islandia. Publicada en el Eco de los folletines. Madrid, 1854-6. 9 vols.
34. Ángelo, Tirano de Padua. Drama en cinco actos por Victor Hugo. Copia original francesa con la traducción española por Francisco Calcagno. Preparado expresamente para Mr Raphael Felix, director de la compañía francesa de M^{lle} Rachel. Nueva York, Imprenta de Baker and Godwin, Esquina de las calles de Nassau y Spruce, 1855. [B.Nac.]
35. Poesías selectas de Victor Hugo. Traducidas por Teodoro Llorente. Madrid, 1860. [B.Nac., B.Cat.]

216 *The Influence of Victor Hugo on Spanish Drama*

- 35 *a.* Nuestra Señora de París. Traducida por J. M. de Tejada. Madrid, 1861.
36. Ángel, Tirano de Padua. Drama en tres actos por Victor Hugo. Valparaíso, Imprenta y Librería del Mercurio, 1862. [Val.U.]
37. Los Miserables. Por Victor Hugo. Traducción de D. Nemesio Fernández Cuesta. Madrid, Gaspar, 1862-3. 10 vols. [B.Nac. has Vol. 1 only.] According to Palau, Gaspar reprinted this in 1863 (5 vols).
38. Victor Hugo. Los Miserables. Tomo primero. Madrid. Administración, Calle de Valencia, 28. No date. Probably before 1850. [B.Nac.]
39. Victor Hugo. El Noventa y Tres. Versión castellana. Tomo primero. Madrid. Administración, Calle de Valencia, 28. No date. Probably before 1850. [B.Nac.]

Note: In the inner wrapper of *Colección de Refranes*, Oliveres, Barcelona, 1841, there is the following advertisement:

Imprenta y Librería de Juan Oliveres. Obras en prensa que se publicarán en dicha librería: Victor Hugo: María Tudor, en 4 actos. Victor Hugo: Voltaire y Mirabeau.

We have no proof that the volumes were in fact published.

ADELAIDE PARKER.

E. ALLISON PEERS.

LIVERPOOL.

LANDNÁMABÓK: ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF ICELANDIC FEUD

THE plentiful and interesting evidence that *Landnámabók* offers for a study of the feud procedure of the Icelandic Söguöld has not yet received the attention it deserves. Even Heusler's splendid book, *Das Strafrecht der Isländersagas* (Leipzig, 1911), pays no attention to it, and yet its testimony obviously has an especial weight. The Sagas, in general, were the histories of single families and their more distinguished representatives, but *Landnámabók* was, as its name implies, the Book of the Land-takings, or Settlements, a concise and comprehensive account of most of the families of note (about 400 in number) that first settled in Iceland, a source of information, reliable if not often detailed, of their vicissitudes for several generations. Interspersed amongst a tremendous amount of genealogical information, there are brief descriptions of religious and social customs, and short accounts of important episodes in the history of many of these families. All this is told in a brief unelaborated fashion which at times tends to obscure an event, but it is hoped that this article will clear up the most doubtful passages.

First it will be instructive to contrast, in the light of Heusler's figures for the Sagas, the three divisions of private vengeance, agreement or arbitration, and legal procedure, into which feud proceedings clearly fall. I have found forty-nine cases of feud in *Landnámabók*. This total excludes (1) feud happenings in Norway or the Islands, (2) parallel accounts or the frequent mention of cases known to the Sagas¹, and (3) references to Wager-of-Battle (*hólmganga*), which need a fuller treatment than is possible here. Of this number thirty-three are cases of private action, carried out by the initiative and strength of those concerned, and seeking no external help from law or arbitration. A further five cases are arbitration proceedings², and the remaining eleven show indubitable signs of legal procedure³. Thus the sphere of legal action is at least as circumscribed as in the Sagas, a conclusion strengthened when we remember that four of these lawsuits took place during a long-drawn feud between the same two families (5, 7, 2). The proportion of cases of

¹ 2, 7, 6; 2, 9, 3; 2, 10, 4; 2, 11, 6; 2, 12, 1; 2, 12, 2; 2, 15, 2; 2, 17, 4; 2, 24, 2; 3, 1, 2; 3, 5, 12; 3, 5, 16; 3, 9, 2; 3, 21, 2; 4, 14, 10; 5, 4, 6; 5, 7, 7; 5, 7, 8. Certain inconclusive references, 2, 7, 2; 2, 17, 5; 2, 20, 1; etc., have also been omitted. All references are to Book, Section, and Subsection in Vigfusson and Powell's edition, in *Origines Islandicae*, Vol. I, Oxford, 1905.

² 2, 17, 6; 3, 12, 7; 3, 15, 5, 5, 12, 2; 5, 12, 4.

³ 2, 6, 2; 2, 17, 4; 2, 17, 6; 2, 18, 3; 2, 24, 1; 2, 30, 4; 3, 21, 3; 5, 7, 2 (four cases); 5, 12, 2

blood-feud is even greater than in the Sagas. A table of the actual numbers will make the matter clear¹.

| Total | Blood-feud | Arbitration | Legal | Legal cases | | |
|-------|------------|-------------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | Legal sentences | Becoming arbitration | Broken up by force |
| 520 | 297 | 104 | 119 | 50 | 60 | 9 |
| 49 | 33 | 5 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 3 |

Of these eleven lawsuits, two ended in favour of the pursuant, and resulted in a sentence of full outlawry (*skóggangr*), 2, 17, 6 for sheep-stealing, 2, 24, 1 for the abduction of a woman. In one case the defendant was able to quash the case brought against him (*hann únytte mál fyrir Erne*), which freed him from any penalty (5, 12, 2). Eight cases did not get as far as a Court sentence. Five declined into arbitration (3, 21, 3; 5, 7, 2, four cases), while two, a case for witchcraft (2, 6, 2) and a case for horse-stealing (2, 30, 4), were violently interrupted between the summons (*stefna*) and the time when they should be settled at the Thing, and an eighth case ended in the slaying of one of the litigants (2, 18, 3). Four cases were for the theft of live stock, and four for slayings.

Lon-Einar summoned the mother of his namesake Einar for witchcraft, because a stranded whale drifted away from his foreshore to that of Einar. He carried out the summons while Einar was away from home, but was pursued as he was returning from the *stefnuþór*, and was slain with six of his companions (2, 6, 2). The matter rested there. The plaintiff was personally responsible for the conduct of his case. If he were removed the case fell through, and only the action of a new *eptirmálsmaðr* or prosecutor could set it on foot again. The episode has a threefold significance. First, it shows the peril always attendant on legal procedure; secondly, the sense of indignity which affected the summoned; and thirdly, the way in which a legal prosecution could be brushed aside by one ready to assert himself with his own weapons of violence and self-help.

There is a second example of a legal prosecution going no further than the *stefna*. Hromund and his sons summoned the brothers Helgi and Iorund for horse-theft, but some time after, before the case could go before the Althing, where they had been cited, the brothers attacked their summoners and a serious encounter took place. Hromund was slain with one of his sons, and Iorund fell with six men. Helgi and the rest of his men put to sea immediately and left the land, and the case seems to have rested there (2, 30, 4). Here again we see a determined

¹ The figures for the Sagas are from Heusler, *Strafrecht*, pp. 40-41.

effort on the part of those who felt themselves strong enough to check those who had an unanswerable legal charge by a display of superior might.

The examples of arbitration proceedings in *Landnámabók* are very similar to those of the Sagas. In 3, 15, 5 Asmund with forty men prevented an armed clash between the forces of his brother and his brother's adversary, and then set them at one, and in 5, 12, 2 Onund Bild rode between the conflicting forces of two enemies and parted them (*skilðe*), though six men were slain before his intervention¹. A striking instance of how the services of an arbitrator might settle a long series of slayings is supplied by the account in 3, 12, 7 of the feud between Thormod the Strong and Olaf Beck. 'He had a feud with Olaf Beck about Hvandal, and was the death of seventeen men before he and Olaf were set at one (*aðr þeir sættosk*); it was decided that each should have it every other summer.' The futility of the seventeen slayings (there may well have been many more, since they are all credited to the one side) is shown most strongly by the final award, which did no more than effect a compromise which might well have satisfied both sides before the slayings began. But the sense of self-reliance, so akin to arrogance, which characterised this warrior people, the overwhelming significance of the test of condition (*skapraun*), led to the use of violence and set aside any idea of recourse to settlement either by law or by the good offices of well-dispositioned men and friends of both parties. Another quarrel over land, that between the aged but powerful chieftain Geirmund and his neighbour Kjallak, was settled without the shedding of blood by the arbitration of two friends (2, 17, 6).

There are two interesting incidents which add to our knowledge of the methods of compensation, more particularly the principle of balance, which were employed by the arbitrators to reach their award. Neither incident is clear in all its details, but the main facts seem straightforward enough.

Hrafn and Atli had a quarrel over a piece of land. In a fight between them Atli and one of his housecarles were slain on the one side, while on the other Hrafn was badly, but not mortally, wounded, and four (Hauksbók) or two (Sturlubók) of his housecarles were slain. The combatants were then parted. Six years later Thord, the son of Atli, who had grown to manhood, slew Hrafn to avenge his father. 'The slayings were set off against each other (*vígen fellask í faðma*). Thord became famous

¹ I have not counted this in the total of cases of arbitration. It led to no settlement of the dispute, but was a step undertaken of Onund's own will to part the combatants.

for this deed' (5, 12, 2). Obviously no settlement of any kind had taken place after the slaying of Atli. First, it is unlikely that Thord would have gained fame for breaking a truce, and second, only the one slaying took place after Onund had parted the combatants. Therefore at the subsequent arbitration (there seems no doubt that it was such) the deaths of Atli and one follower were reckoned equal to the deaths of Hrafn and four or two followers. Hrafn, it may be noticed, was the aggressor when Atli lost his life. Consequently, if, as seems probable, Sturlubók, as the older version, has preserved the more accurate account of the affair, it is justifiable to regard the life of the remaining housecarle as forfeit for the assault.

The second episode is not very clear in one particular, but the principle involved is the same as that above. Helgi first warned Thorgrim against visiting his widowed mother, and then, when the warning was disregarded, slew him. 'Ashild (Helgi's mother) said he had struck a blow that would cost him his head. Helgi took a passage abroad at Einarshavn. Haering, Thorgrim's son, was then sixteen years old.' He sought help from Teit, his kinsman. 'Teit and his men rode fifteen together to prevent Helgi's journey abroad. They met.... There fell Helgi and a man with him, and one of Teit's men. The slaying was counted as equal (*i faðma fellosk víg þau*)' (5, 12, 4). There is a possibility that Helgi had been banished abroad after the slaying of Thorgrim, or he may have decided to get away from a district where he had to face the certainty of feud. If the former supposition is true, then Helgi was caught out of his sanctuary while going to his ship, his death did not count in the award, and so one death on each side tallied. If Helgi were not an outfarer (or a district-outlaw caught out of his district), his death would balance that of Thorgrim, and the other two slayings again tallied. The second interpretation is the more probable, but the principle of balance is clear in either case.

The information which *Landnámabók* supplies about outlawry is interesting always as confirmation of the Sagas, and one or two episodes need special discussion. The references to district-outlawry present no new feature. But there are two incidents, one in *Landnámabók* and the other in *Íslendingabók*, for which it is important to find an adequate explanation. According to *Landnámabók* 2, 17, 6, 'Geirmund set up four farms...the third at the West Common Land, which Bjorn the thrall looked after, who was afterwards outlawed for sheep-stealing after Geirmund's death. His outlaw-goods (*sekþarfé*) became common property.' The evidence of the Sagas shows that during the Söguöld it

was customary for the outlaw to seize his outlaw's property at the Court of Execution (*féránsdómr*); the testimony of Grágás is equally definite that according to later Icelandic law half the outlaw's property went to the outlaw and half to the men of the Thing-Quarter. But here, and in the following case from *Íslendingabók*, all the forfeited property would seem at first sight to have gone to the community. 'But the man who owned the land at Blaskogar had been made an outlaw for the murder of a thrall or a freedman (*sekr of þraelsmorð eða leysings*). His name is given as Thorir Cropbeard....And he that was murdered was called Kol, and the rift is called Kolsgia after him, where his corpse was found. That land became afterwards the property of all men, and the men of the land appointed it for the maintenance of the Althing' (3, 2). Both of these cases, I think, admit of an explanation which brings them into line with the usual procedure of the Soguöld. Heusler suggests (*Strafrecht*, p. 149) that the prosecution may not have been a private one, but may have been carried out by the *goði* of the district on behalf of the community, and on that account the community shared Thorir's goods. There is also the possibility that, in *Íslendingabók*, a public-spirited prosecutor gave the land that was his by right for its excellent purpose, and kept the movable goods for himself. The action was not for a kinsman or friend. There is no mention of any property save the land, but since the sentence must have been one of *skóggangr* or full outlawry, everything the outlaw had owned was confiscated. Such a division of the outlaw's goods would have nothing in common with thirteenth-century procedure, but would be decided by the pursuant himself. Finally it is worth noticing that there is no direct, but only implied, evidence that the land at once became a possession of the Congregation for Law. It may well have been in private hands for an interval before the community acquired it.

The passage from *Landnámabók* requires a somewhat different explanation. Possibly the sheep-stealing had affected so many of Bjorn's neighbours that the prosecutor (it is beyond doubt that there was an individual prosecutor, and that the community was not the pursuant) acted as the representative of a group. It is probable, too, that Bjorn had not come to own the land over which he had been set as steward, and so all his outlaw-goods would be movables. This would be shared out amongst those who had suffered by his depredations. It is certain that genuine charges on the estate of the outlaw had to be met before the pursuant carried out his seizure, and the Sagas offer examples of such recompense. In this case too, as in the first, we must remember the degree of personal decision which characterised feud proceedings during

the Söguöld. When the litigant had complied with the necessary legal forms, he was free to exercise his own judgment thenceforth.

One extract from *Landnámabók* still remains for discussion for the light it sheds on law, arbitration, and outlawry in particular, and the conduct of the feud in general, in early Iceland. The events took place about the middle of the tenth century. The parts of the narrative most important for our purpose are best told in the historian's own words. Sniallstein slew Sigmund. 'For this slaying the Baugssons (Sniallstein and his brothers) were made outlaws all over the Hlid....Sniallstein went to Sniallshead. It pleased Thorgerd, Sigmund's daughter, ill, that her father's slayer should have come out thither, and she egged on Onund Bild, her husband, to avenge Sigmund. Onund went with thirty men to Sniallshead, and there set fire to the house. Sniallstein walked out, and gave himself up. They led him to the Head, and slew him there. His brother Gunnar took up the case for this slaying....Onund was outlawed for the slaying of Sniallstein. He stayed home for two winters with many men.' Gunnar and his brother-in-law Orn kept watch on Onund, and slew him 'as he was going from the games to his horses.' Gunnar was slain at the same time. 'But when the sons of Onund grew up, they besought Mord their kinsman to follow up the suit. Mord declared it would be an awkward business after an outlawed man. They said they were most angry with Orn who dwelt nearest them. This was Mord's advice—that they should get a forest-going case against Orn, and so drive him from the countryside. The sons of Onund brought an action of pasture against Orn, and he was thus outlawed, that he should fall unhallowed (*óheilagr*) before the sons of Onund everywhere except in Vaelugerth (his own farmstead), and within an arrow-shot-length (*örskotshelgr*) around his land. The sons of Onund watched for him, but he took good care of himself. But once, when Orn was driving cattle out of his land, they fell on him and slew him, and everyone thought that he would have fallen unhallowed. Orn's brother paid Thormod Thjostarson that he should hallow Orn—Thormod had then returned to Eyrr from abroad. He shot so long a shot from his bow that the slaying was within his arrow-shot-length. Then Gunnar's sons took up the case for Orn's death, but Mord helped those brethren. They paid no fine, but became district-outlaws in Floa' (5, 7, 2).

Here we see how the law was used as a convenience by a litigant, as a weapon for the prosecution of his feud against an adversary. The punishment of outlawry is here regarded as a cold-blooded means to an end. Both Onund and Orn seem to have been outlawed in the hope that their

deaths would follow. After the outlawry of each, the outlaws kept close watch upon them, waiting for the first opportunity to slay them. Such slayings had the great advantage that the slayer was within his legal rights when they were carried out. The slaying of Orn, in particular, was a fine example of legal strategy. The sons of Onund seemed to have put themselves on the right side of the law in their revenge for a slain father, but the tables were turned upon them by the extraordinarily long shot of Thormod, which proved that they had killed Orn within his lawful sanctuary. But for the help of Mord, their powerful kinsman, they would have been subjected to a much severer punishment than district-outlawry. All four lawsuits declined into arbitration. One penalty only was known to the Icelandic Courts, that of full outlawry, and any other result to a feud proceeding is conclusive evidence of some other than a legal settlement. The outlawries for the slayings of Sigmund and Orn were district-outlawries (*heraðssekþ*), those for the slaying of Sniallstein and for the pasture-action against Orn examples of the frequent banishment for three years. Onund stayed home for two years after his sentence, and was therefore not a district-outlaw. Orn was granted definite sanctuary in Iceland, with, it would seem, the unmistakable, though unmentioned, stipulation that at some time or another he should fare abroad for a period. Probably he was granted a three years' respite in Iceland, and we have here a rudimentary example of the life-ring-garth (*fjörbaugsgarðr*) which is found occasionally in the Sagas, and which became later the highly-elaborated banishment for three years of Grágás. If so, the episode is very important for the light it sheds on the difference between Saga and Grágás law.

There are five references to slayings at the Thing in *Landnámabók*¹. The perilous nature of legal procedure is, of course, one of the most prominent features of the legal evidence of the Sagas. It is not always clear whether these slain men were participators in suits, or whether their deaths are a further testimony to the likelihood of armed strife at the Congregation for Law. One man at least was slain because of his interference in an action primarily between two other men. Thorvald Olafsson had a suit for sheep-stealing against Thorarin, but Ogmund followed up the suit for him. 'Therefore Thorarin slew Ogmund at the Thorskafjörð Thing' (2, 18, 3)². Whether Ogmund took over the suit for

¹ 2, 18, 3; 2, 25, 2, 3, 4, 1; 3, 5, 16; 4, 18, 6.

² Vigfusson and Powell have given a dubious version of this passage in *Or. Isl.* i, 93, but in the Corrigenda to Vol. i there is a literal translation of the text. I have referred to the *Islandínga Sögur* edition of *Landnámabók* by Ásmundarson, 1891, for the corrective of a second text.

the good will he bore to the first pursuant, or whether he saw in it a chance for personal gain or glory, he paid with his life for his interference in other men's legal affairs. The prospect of gain was always balanced by the real danger of the procedure.

Landnámabók contains only one reference to murder (*morð*). Godlaug's ship was wrecked, and he, his wife and infant daughter were the only ones to get to land. They were found by Thorbjorn Bitra, who murdered man and wife, but kept the young child and brought her up. Godlaug's brother heard of this, 'and avenged his brother, and slew Thorbjorn Bitra and many other men besides' (2, 29, 5). It was for the murder of a thrall or freedman that Thorir was outlawed (*Íslendingabók* 3, 2). He had concealed the corpse of his victim, and so neglected the notification of his deed to which the slayer was in honour bound, and the neglect of which aggravated the consequences of his deed.

There is little else that need be said about the feud proceedings in *Landnámabók*. The characteristics of private vengeance were those of the Sagas. There is the same overpowering tendency to wreak vengeance for oneself, the same avoidance of the gentler methods of settling a dispute. The following references are not consecutive, but illustrate the various features of the blood-feud as they are found in the Sagas.

(1) 'Arngeir and Thorgils went from home in a snowstorm to seek their sheep, and they did not come back. Odd went to look for them, and he found them, and a white bear had killed them, and was sucking their blood. Odd slew the bear, and went home and ate it all, and he declared he had avenged his father (Arngeir) when he slew the bear, and his brother (Thorgils) when he ate it' (3, 22, 4).

(2) There are five instances of *inbrenna*, or the burning of an enemy in his house, in *Landnámabók*, of which two only are straightforward feud proceedings (2, 1, 2; 5, 7, 2)¹.

(3) The most frequent causes of feud were land and livestock. There are nine instances of feud over the one or the other².

(4) Not one of the instances in which libel or defamation of character is mentioned in *Landnámabók* was settled by law or arbitration³. In each case a personal insult was avenged on the person of the insulter.

(5) Slayings took place for all sorts of reasons, some sufficient, some most trifling. A quarrel as to who should cross a ferry first led ultimately to the deaths of ten men (5, 7, 2). Bad blood over a piece of land led to a

¹ 1, 10, 2; 2, 1, 2; 2, 4, 12; 2, 20, 5; 5, 7, 2. Three further examples in Norway, 3, 13, 2; 3, 15, 3; 5, 8, 2.

² 1, 6, 7; 1, 7, 10; 2, 2, 1; 2, 6, 2; 2, 18, 3; 2, 18, 5; 3, 12, 7; 4, 17, 2; 5, 12, 2.
3, 5, 16; 3, 19, 1; 4, 7, 3.

pitched battle in which twelve men were slain (1, 6, 7). Leidolf slew his son-in-law because he wished to desert his wife (4, 7, 2).

(6) *Landnámabók* contains two instances of the slaying of those not *vápnfærr*, that is, those unable to bear weapons. Hallbjorn slew his wife because she would not obey him (2, 26, 3), and in 2, 16, 2 a boy of seven years was slain with his father.

GWYN JONES.

MANCHESTER.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

FURTHER EMENDATIONS OF THE 'BEOWULF' TEXT¹.

l. 262. MS. *wæs min fæder*. This half-line should be considered with *gesloh þin fæder*, l. 459 and *þone þin fæder*, l. 2048, as well as with *þæt hit a mid gemete*, l. 779, and *þær him nænig water*, l. 1514. In each of the first three cases Holthausen, followed by other commentators, has proposed an emendation 'on metrical grounds,' and for the same reason the last two have been regarded as unsatisfactory. But no change is needed, as the verse-type, a one-stress B, though rare, is, like the much more common one-stress A, quite a definite one; cf. *Gen.* l. 707, *þe him þæt wif*, l. 1337, *þara þe to mete*, l. 1401, *nymþe heo wæs ahafen*, etc.

l. 357. MS. *eald ond unhar*. The only possible meaning of *unhar* is 'not white,' exactly the contrary of what we should expect. Trautmann's emendation *anhar*, approved by other editors and said by Chambers to be 'simple and final,' is apparently based on an emendation, *anforht* for the MS. reading *unforht*, 'timid,' in the *Dream of the Rood*, l. 117, and *uncyðig: uncyðig*, *El.* ll. 725, 961. Preferable to this would be *inhar*, 'very white,' on the analogy of *infrod*, 'very old,' l. 2449; cf. also *inhold*, 'very loyal,' and *myslede*, 'very full of water,' 'flooded.' But *unhar* may stand for *unhror*, 'not active,' just as *hror*, 'stirring,' 'vigorous' is used of a warrior in his prime. Moreover, the first of the two copyists of the *Beowulf* MS. has a habit of either omitting the letter *r*, as in ll. 447, 567, or inserting it, as in ll. 175, 763, 902, 1117, 1333.

ll. 667-668. MS. *sundor nytte beheold ymb aldor dena eoton weard abead*. Editors, who all retain *abead*, find it impossible to take *eoton* and *weard* as separate words, so they read *eotonwearde* or *eotonweard* and translate 'he (i.e. either God or Beowulf) kept guard against the giant.' But *abeodan* has nowhere else such a meaning, it means 'to announce,' 'deliver a message or greeting'; cp. *word abead*, l. 390, *hæl abead*, l. 653, *hælo abead*, l. 2418. We propose therefore to read *eoton weard abreot*, 'the guardian (Beowulf) destroyed the giant,' a terse rounding off of the paragraph which is a favourite practice of the poet, cf. *ferh ellen wræc*, l. 2706. The verb *abreotan* occurs frequently in the poem; for the omission of *r* see note on l. 357; for *t* written *d* cf. MS. *fædde* for *fætte*, l. 1750.

l. 747. MS. *rinc on raste ræhte ongean*. There is no need to emend, as

¹ See *Mod. Lang. Rev.* xxvii, pp. 448 ff.

Sievers does, *ongean to togeanes*, if we supply *ond* before *ræhte*. The scribe occasionally omits *ond*; cf. l. 431.

l. 947. MS. *secg betsta*. Here, as in l. 1759, Sievers reads *secga*, on metrical grounds, but this is unnecessary, for *betost*, the earlier form of the superlative (cf. l. 3007), can be used metrically just like *cynning*; cf. *feorh cynninges*, l. 1210, and *fyll cynninges*, l. 2912. In the same way the MS. reading *ðegn betstan*, l. 1871, should be restored to *ðegn betostan*.

l. 1833. MS. *þæt ic þe wel herige ond þe to geoce garholt bere*. The verb *herige* can only mean 'praise,' a sense which is, as Chambers says, 'hard to parallel.' Better sense would be obtained if we read *nerige*, 'rescue,' 'save.' An *n* might easily be written *h* by the careless copyist.

ll. 1838, 1839. MS. *feorcyþðe beoð selran gesohte þæm þe him selfa deah*. These words are usually rendered 'far countries are better when visited by one who is himself of worth.' But the construction, far from making an 'idiomatic impression,' as it does on Klaeber, seems to us a strange one. We suggest *selfan* for *selran* and translate, 'far countries are visited in person by the man who is himself of worth.' Here there is an effective contrast between *selfan* and *him selfa*.

ll. 1933-5. MS. *nænig þæt dorste deor geneþan swæsra gesiða nefne sunfrea þæt hire an dæges eagum starede*. There are three difficulties here, (a) to account for the case of *hire*, (b) the construction of *starede*, (c) is *an dæges* to be taken as two words or one? In ll. 996, 1485 *starian* is used with *on* and the accusative. Holthausen therefore alters *hire* to *hæ* and takes it as governed by *an* = *on* following its case, but such a construction except at the end of a sentence is inadmissible. The only possible way of accounting for the dative case of *hire* (the genitive for the moment being excluded) is either (a) to assume, with Bugge, that *an dæges* is for *andæges* = *andeges*, which on the analogy of the Gothic *andaugeo*, 'openly,' may be, though not elsewhere found, a prepositional adverb meaning 'face to face with,' or else (b) to assume that *an dæges* results from the careless transcription of another adverb or adverbial phrase governing the dative case. Such an adverbial phrase is *an egesan* = *on egesan*, and we translate 'none so bold of the dear retainers as to venture to gaze at her with intimidating mien,' i.e., defy her with a bold stare. For *on egesan* with dative cf. *eldum on andan*, l. 2314. It is also possible, but less advisable, with this reading to regard *hire* as a genitive and *egesan* as abstract used for concrete, 'her terrible aspect' like *mid gryrum ecga*, l. 483, and *wæteregegan*, l. 1260. It looks as if the copyist mistook the *an* of the MS. he was transcribing for *and*, and failed to understand *ægesā*.

l. 1944. MS. *huru þæt onhohnod hem ninges mæg*. Over the second *h* of

onhohnod above the line an *s* is written. Bugge's suggestion that *onhohsman* = 'hamstring,' and so 'hinder,' is from *hohsinu*, 'sinew of hough or heel,' apart from its improbability, is inadmissible, as such a verb would be *onhohsnewian*, pp. *onhohsnewod*. We suggest either *huru þæt* (or *þæs*) *onhreowsode*, 'was sorry for that,' or *huru wæs on hreon mode*, 'was furious,' or 'was sad,' as *hreon* may come from *hreo*h or from *hreo*w. The verb *onhreowsian* is not found elsewhere, but *hrecowsian*, 'to be sorry,' 'repent,' is very common. The adjective *hreo*h, 'fierce,' 'savage,' is in some instances confused with *hreo*w, 'sad,' 'sorrowful'; cf. *blodreow*, l. 1719, *guðreow*, l. 58, and *wæltreow*, l. 629. For omission of *r* cf. *deorc* for *dreore*, l. 447, and *sweodum* for *sweordum*, l. 567; for confusion of *eo* and *o* cf. *gehleod*, l. 895, *scotenum* for *sceotendum*, l. 1026, *abreoten* for *abroten*, l. 1599, and *weordum* for *wordum*, l. 1833. An *n* might easily be written *h* by the unintelligent copyist. Of these two suggestions we prefer *onhreowsode*, as it accounts for the *s* written above the line in the MS. We may note that if Bugge's idea is accepted it would be better to read *huru þæt on hoh asnāð*.

l. 2006. MS. *swa...gylpan þearf*. The two Thorkelin transcripts show that the word immediately following *swa* began with a letter with a long upright stroke. As *ne* is required in order to make sense, we may assume that the original text had both *he* and *ne*: *swa he gylpan ne þearf*, and that the copyist, as he so often did, omitted *ne*. The emendation *begylpan*, adopted by some commentators, has no authority.

ll. 2241-3. MS. *beorh eallgearo winode on wonge wæteryðum neah niwe be næsse neawocræftum fæst*. The adjective *niwe*, 'new,' cannot be right here, as the grave-mound was in existence when the treasure was hidden in it 'long before,' *on geardagum*, l. 2233, and the dragon had occupied it for three hundred years, as we learn from ll. 2278, 2279. The adjective usually spelt *neowol* occurs in a number of forms: *niowul*, *niwol*, *niwel*, *neol*, *nefol*, etc.; it means 'lying low,' 'prone,' and when, as is frequently the case, it is used in connection with precipices, cliffs, chasms, etc. it means 'deep down,' 'precipitous,' even 'bottomless.' Reading *niwel* we translate 'A grave-mound, all ready to hand, was situated on a shelf far down the cliff close to the water, cunningly placed in security.' As usual, the poet has a perfectly clear picture in his mind, he describes what he has himself seen. In l. 2307 we are told that the dragon *no on wealle leng bidan wolde*, where *wealle* means 'cliff,' i.e. the face of the cliff, for which cf. *of wealle geseah*, l. 229. It may be noted that the copyist was probably accustomed to the spelling *neowol* as in l. 1411 and did not recognise the word when spelt *niwel*.

l. 2288. MS. *stonc ða æfter stane*. Editors have taken *stonc* to be the past tense of *stincan*, 'to emit a smell,' with the meaning 'to sniff or snuff.' But nowhere is *stincan* found with such a meaning. We take *stonc* as written for *stong*, past tense of *stingan*, 'to stab or sting,' which is particularly used of serpents as well as of insects, and is here appropriate; cf. *wyrm stingeð nieten* quoted by Bosworth-Toller. Translate '(the dragon) snapped or stabbed (as he moved) along the wall.' In O.E. MSS. final *c* and *g* following *n* are often written *cg*, *gc*, or even *c*; cf. *gecranc*, l. 1209.

ll. 2333-5. MS. *hæfde ligdraca leoda fæsten ealond utan eorðweard ðone gledum forgrunden*. By some commentators *ealond* is translated 'land bordered by water,' 'coast,' but the use of *fæsten* and *utan* seems to indicate that the Geatish citadel is meant, and it is possible that it was on an island separated by a narrow channel from the mainland.

l. 2367. MS. *oferswam ða sioleða bigong sunu ecgðeowes*. The form *sioleða* occurs nowhere else, so we suggest *solewa*, 'waters,' 'seas.' The noun *sol* (n.) or *solu* (f.) is frequently found in A.S. charters with the meaning 'miry place,' 'shallow pond.' For the form *solewa* cf. *heorotsolve*, occurring in a charter. A *w* is very like a *þ* in O.E. script. The restriction in meaning of words used to denote natural features such as seas, hills, forests etc. finds many illustrations in English dialects and place-names; e.g., 'eagre' or 'aigre,' 'mere' etc.

ll. 2455-7. MS. *gesyðð sorhcearig...windgereste reote berofene*. Editors generally accept Holthausen's suggestion that *reote* is for an earlier *rate* = *rête*, connected with the adjective *rôt*, 'cheerful,' and meaning 'gladness,' 'joy,' but such a noun does not occur elsewhere. Remembering the scribe's frequent difficulty with the letter *r* we suggest *reorde*, 'speech'; cf. *Wanderer*, l. 86, *oþ þæt burgwara breaktma lease...idlu stodon*. A *d* might easily be written *t* by the copyist, as in some scripts they are very much alike.

l. 2468. MS. *he ða mid þære sorhge þe him sio sar belamp*. If we read *sare* and transpose *sio* to its proper place just before *þe*, with which it forms a compound relative pronoun, there is no difficulty in the passage.

ll. 2908-10. *eorl ofer oðrum unlifigendum healdeð hige mæðum heafodwearde leofes ond laðes*. There is no need to alter *higemæðum*, as some commentators do, to *higemēðum*. Wiglaf guards friend and foe (the dragon) 'with balance of mind,' i.e. impartially. *Mæð*, a common word, means 'due proportion' or 'measure.'

ll. 2957-60. MS. *þa wæs æht boden sweona leodum segn higelace freoðowong þone forð ofereodon syððan hreðlingas to hagan þrungon*. Editors have

taken *æht* as = *ōht*, 'persecution,' or else as = *æht* (*āgan*), 'treasure.' But this meaning belongs to the plural alone; in our poem the singular is used with the meaning of 'possession,' 'power,' 'disposal.' This mistake has led to unnecessary emendations of the text. The word *eaht*, variously spelt *æht*, *aht*, *eht*, means 'deliberation,' 'discussion,' and is related to *eahtian*, 'to discuss,' 'appraise,' 'esteem,' which occurs several times in the poem. Another point is that *freodowong* is by commentators rendered 'place of refuge,' 'fastness,' whereas it can only mean 'ground where no fighting is allowed.' Difficulties disappear if we assume that Hygelac wanted to settle accounts with Ongentheow alone, and offered honourable terms of capitulation and safe-conduct to the Swedish king's followers if they would leave him to fight singly against Eofor and Wulf, the champions appointed for the purpose by Hygelac. Thus we translate 'Then was (matter for) discussion (i.e. terms of capitulation) offered to the Swedes, and a standard made over by them to Hygelac. They (the Swedes) then issued (from the fort) over the terrain, now safe for them (*freodowong*), when (or, then) the Hrethlings (the Geats) pressed forward to the stockade (to deal with Ongentheow).' The standard presented to Hygelac was a symbol of the Swedes' submission. In this passage we have another case of tragic conflict in the breasts of a chieftain's retainers, *þa him swa gefearfod wæs* (l. 1103).

ll. 3014-15. MS. *þa sceal brond fretan æled þeccean*. Editors have kept *þeccean* and translate 'them (the rings etc.) shall the fire devour, the flames cover.' If we read *þecgean*, 'parch,' 'consume,' 'destroy,' we get much better sense; the word is fairly common; cf. *Crist* l. 1509, *þurste geþegede*, and *Wulf and Eadwacer* l. 2, *willað hy hine aþecgan*.

ll. 3038-40. MS. *ær hi þær gesegan syllicran wiht wyrn on wonge wder-ræhtes þær lūðne licgean*. As an emendation is required, Sievers reads *þær hi þa gesegan*, but the comparative *syllicran* is still unaccounted for. We read *næs hi ær gesegan* and translate 'They had never before seen a more wondrous creature, the horrible dragon lying there opposite on the ground.' Only one word thus needs alteration, instead of two, and the required sense is obtained.

ll. 3114-15. MS. *nu sceal gled fretan weaxan wonna leg wigena strengel*. Some commentators regard *weaxan wonna leg* as a parenthesis, *weaxan* depending on *sceal*. Others emend *weaxan* to *wascan* 'to wash,' a bold metaphor. Perhaps we should read *weaxen*, and translate 'the full-grown sooty flame'; *leg* is thus in apposition with *gled*.

W. J. SEDGEFIELD.

OLD ENGLISH 'REORD.'

The Germanic sound succession *z* plus consonant usually develops in O.E. as a combination *r* plus consonant which has precisely the same effect of diphthongization upon preceding vowels as *r* plus consonant of Germanic origin. Examples are *mearg*, *earnian* (probably), *meord*, *heord*, *leornian*. There is, however, a group of words *reord* 'voice,' *reord* 'food,' and their compounds, which in Germanic had probably the sound-succession *-azd-*, but which in O.E. seem to exhibit breaking of *e*, or rather of *i*, for Northumbrian has a liking for *io* forms in these words, and has no *ea* forms, though frequently having *meard*¹.

The cognates show *reord* 'voice' to be from Germanic **razdō* (Gothic *razda*, O.N. *rodd*, O.H.G. *rarta*). Middle English forms prove a **reard* for Old Kentish. Accordingly, the usual explanation of O.E. *reord* that it is from an ablaut form **rezdō* is hard to maintain, nor do any of the attempts to trace the root beyond Germanic lead to any confidence in a grade *rez*. Similarly, though *reord* 'food' has no certain cognate outside O.E., such suggestions as can be made point to a Germanic **razdō*². Accordingly, it seems likely that Germanic *a* is exceptionally influenced in these words.

Z/R is well known to have had a mutating power in O.N., by which, among other changes, *a* > *æ/e*: e.g., *ker* (Gothic *kas*), *ver* (cp. Gothic *wasjan*). As a rule, of course, it has no such influence in O.E. However, it might have had such an influence when *i/j* followed. In short I would assume a mutating power for the group Germanic *-zdi-* at a very early period in O.E. though subsequently to the Anglo-Frisian change *a* > *æ*. Therefore, in the words considered above, the steps of development would be *-azdi-* > *ardi-* > *ærdi-* (Anglo-Frisian fronting) > *-erdi-* (Primitive O.E. *r*-mutation) > *eordi-* (breaking) > *-iordi-* (*i*-mutation) > Northumbrian *-iord-*, Mercian *-eord-*.

If the presence of the sound succession *-zdi-* is necessary to produce the development of Germanic *ǣ* which is under consideration, the words *reord* f. 'food,' and *reord* f. 'voice' must be derived from Germanic **razdǣ* (*jō*-class). This would be an alternative form to Germanic **razdō*, which was also received into O.E., becoming **reard*, but not recorded until the Middle English period. There are also recorded neuter variants for

¹ Words connected with *reord* 'voice' and *reord* 'food' have 10 58 times in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, the Northumbrian part of the *Rushworth Gospels*, and the *Durham Ritual*. *eo* only occurs four times (*Lindisfarne* MS. all instances). *Meord* has *ea* 32 times (*eo* once in *Rushworth* MS), *e* once by error in the *Lindisfarne* MS.

² Probably to root *ras* seen in Gothic *rasta* and *razn*. Cp. O.N. **gredda* (cp. *greddir*) < **garazdhan-*.

both the 'food' and 'voice' words: **gereorde* seems established by the recorded plurals *gercordu/o*. These forms would develop in O.E. from Germanic **razdia* in conformity with the theory advanced above. There is also evidence for a nominative and accusative singular *gereord* in the case of both words. These are to be regarded as *i*-declension neuters. Their plural should be *gereord*, but it has received lexicographical record only in the case of the 'voice' word.

It is to be observed that these words must have been mainly Anglian in the first place. The West Saxon development would be to **rierd*, if *i/j* followed, to **reard* otherwise.

The sound succession *-zdi-* is not frequently found in other words. For *heorde* it seems certain to assume a Germanic form **hezdōn-*, Dutch *herde* (cp. root *kes*, in O. Bulg. *česati*), beside **hazda-*, O.N. *haddr*. No certain cognates can be advanced for *gecneord*. *Gierd* is a far from reliable case: it is widely held to contain Germanic *r* not *z*¹. We are left with *brerd*, *brord*, *breard*, *briord*². *Brord* and *breard* are practically proved by O.H.G. *brort*, *brart* to be from ablaut variants **brozd-*, **brazd-*. *Brerd* might well be a mutation form of the first of these, for, as Sievers suggests (*Zum angelsächsischen Vokalismus*, p. 25), the word may be an original *-os/-es* stem. The Northumbrian form *briord* must similarly be assumed to have a development from **brazdiz-* parallel to that of **razdi-* suggested above, for *eo* forms are not found in Northumbrian and there is no evidence for any grade except **brazd-*, **brozd-*.

It would then appear that in the only cases in O.E. where the development is from the Germanic sound-succession *-azdi-*, the vocalism developed was a primitive *io*, which is preserved in the Northumbrian area, but passes elsewhere into *eo*. In view of the absence of any similar development where *a* was followed by *z* plus a consonant, but not followed by *i*, it seems fairly certain that a special power of the nature suggested above was attached to *-zdi-*. Lack of material renders it impossible to decide if a similar power belonged to groups of *z* plus consonant other than *d* plus *i*. Similarly it is impossible to say if vowels other than *a* were subject to this influence, for, even if words containing all the relevant sound successions could be found, the only other back vowels, *ō* and *ū*, if fronted by an earlier process than *i*-mutation, would undergo no further change, and would appear historically as *ē/ě* and *ȳ*, while *-ezdi-* would be already developed to *-izdi-* in Primitive Germanic, *ī* could be raised no further, and *ē* and West Saxon *æ* would probably resist raising by *-zdi-* just as they after-

¹ See references in Feist, *Wörterbuch der Gotischen Sprache*, s.v. *gazds*.

² *Briord* is the usual Northumbrian form (three cases). *Lindisfarne* MS. has *breard* once.

wards resisted it before *i/j*. It seems that the development is limited to *a* and that it is carried out consistently in the few certain instances.

ALISTAIR CAMPBELL.

OXFORD.

THE CONTINUITY OF ALLITERATIVE TRADITION¹.

Laying aside proofs connected with vocabulary, diction and style, the evidence presented by a study of the metre of early and later alliterative poems in English is so cumulative in its effect as to dispel all doubts. This is important because it must not be thought that any one particular metrical proof would offer conclusive evidence in itself. It is rather that a number of facts all point in one direction. Of these, one might mention such details as the treatment of vocalic alliteration, of alliterating groups, of alliterative types (*aa/ax*, etc.), of rhythmical types, of alliterative enjambment, and of consecutive alliteration. It is with these two last points in which the element of chance might have to be reckoned with that this note is concerned.

Regarding *alliterative enjambment*, the percentages in the Middle English alliterative poems range from 2 to 7.5 per cent., which may indicate a differing preference on the part of certain poets. In seeking to discover whether such a feature is accidental, statistics may, however, be misleading, and in any case must be accompanied by a careful study of every passage concerned. For example, such a passage as *Exodus* 40-1, 41-2, 43-4, 47-8, 48-9, in which no less than six examples occur in so short a space, is of much more value than any statistics in endeavouring to prove that alliterative enjambment is not accidental. Similar examples could be quoted from many other poems. The author of *Joseph of Arimathie* employed an elaborate system of enjambment of different types which could scarcely have been done unconsciously. But further, the artistic value of the device is often so apparent that one would hesitate to dismiss the feature as accidental: cp. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ll. 509-10,

Bryddez busken to bylde, and bremlych syngen
For solace of þe softe somer þat sues þerafter
bi bonk.

Regarding *consecutive alliteration*, this was a recognised device in Middle English alliterative poetry and was definitely overdone by many poets such as the author of *Morte Arthure*, who did not hesitate to link together ten successive lines in this manner. The only point is therefore

¹ *Mod. Lang. Rev.* xxvii, October 1932, pp. 453-4.

whether this device was consciously employed in Old English poetry. Again statistics are misleading. The statement that there are eighteen such couplets in *Judith*, a poem of 350 lines, may not be convincing to some, but *Andreas*, ll. 1363-6 in which alliteration is on *llww* in the four lines, or *Maldon*, ll. 95-7 with alliteration on *www*, are such flagrant examples of a conscious device that no one could remain unconvinced. It is significant that *The Grave*, c. 1150, has a triplet *ddd*. Subsequently some Middle English poets over-emphasised the feature and destroyed its musical value.

Lastly, regarding the survival of the C type, the fact that Middle English does permit of that rhythmical type must be taken into account. Nevertheless, the presence of C types in such great numbers from the very earliest Middle English alliterative poetry is most suggestive. After all, non-alliterative poets of *Lazamon's* period would not have written such a half-line as *The Brut*, 26494, of *þan þeódfólke*.

J. P. OAKDEN.

ST ANDREWS.

A MIDDLE ENGLISH 'TIMOR MORTIS' POEM.

Of the well-known group of Middle English lyrics having as text the phrase from the Office of the Dead, 'Timor mortis conturbat me,' one of the best has hitherto remained unpublished. It is here presented in one of the two versions known to be extant, both of the second half of the fifteenth century. The most striking difference in the two texts is in the order of the stanzas, although verbal variations are found in many lines. Both come from the West Midland, and probably neither is a copy made by or for the original author. Neither text shows great literary or metrical superiority to the other, but, as the Longleat version is slightly the better in these respects, it is here printed in preference to the Porkington text.

An interesting touch is the reference in stanza 4 to what were evidently popular songs of the writer's own time. Neither the English nor the French piece is preserved, to my knowledge, except in these snatches, which are probably the first lines of the songs or else their burdens. The stanza provides a new bit of evidence for the preoccupation of mediæval religious men with the replacing of frivolous songs by grave and spiritual ones.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the kindness and courtesy of the Marquess of Bath in making MS. Longleat 29 accessible to me and giving permission to publish, and of Lord Harlech in granting the same favours for MS. Porkington 10.

MS. Longleat 29
f. 145 v.

(1)

'Timor mortis conturbat me,'
Pys is my song in my old age;
Wyle Y was zonge Y myght nat see
De strayte waye to my last age.
Fortune, wit, and vnstabilte
Disseyuyd me *with* hir bryght visage;
Sche set me on hyr gret ryolte,
Vppon hir whele, on hire hie stag;
But sodenli all pys gan swage,
And deth is com; lo, Y hym see!
Perfore to sey is myne vsage,
'Timor mortis conturbat me.'

(2)

De drede of dethe sore dredyt me
And makyt me ofte to mourne,
For dethe sparyt no degre—
Pys haue Y sey mysylffe full zorne.
zowpe, hele, *and* prosperite
May nat allwey *with* vs soourne,
For wanne deth comyt all pes most fle,
And vs folwynt wherso she turne.
Pou, dethe, art scharper pane pe porne;
Full sore Y drede py cruelt[e];
Perfore quakyng þis song Y lerne:
'Timor mortis conturbat me.'

(3)

What wonder is þowgh Y deth drede
And carfully knoke my conciens?
For þer was neuer none so styff on stede
Agyns dethe myght make deffens.
Y am afferde, for God takyt hede
How ofte Y haue ydone Hym offens
And quitit vs all howre mede,
After oure werkis wanne whe go hens,
And at þe dome how Is sentence,
As clerkes seyn, schall ryghtwysse be.
Mercy, Lord, *and* indulgence,
Quia timor mortis conturbat me.

(4)

Whoso woll beholde and se
Pys wordill mutabill variance,
How vayne glorie *and* false flyte
þat eternaly may no man auance,
And in pys wordyll wanne borne whe be
To wo, travayle, *and* to penance,
And how deth is zeff vs in fe,
Whe schold neuer lust, hop, ne dawnce,
Noþer syng no song of þis new ordenance,
As, 'Herte myne, well may þou be, glad *and* lusty to be,'
Or ellys, 'Ma bell amour, ma ioy en esperance,'
But sey, 'Timor mortis conturbat me.'

f. 146r.

(5)

Was neuer none off such dignite
 Azyns dethe myght make obstakyll;
 Wham he hettyt hurtis he;
 Hym gaynyt neuer bame ne triacle.
 Pys wordill vs blyndyt; whe may nat see
 How bycy dethe is vs to schakyll,
 Pat leuyt in ioy *and* ioylite;
 Whe wene to skape as by meracle.
 Y rede no manis w[yt] be so rakyl
 To *trust* on immortalite;
 For drede Y dar nat crye ne cakle,
 Quia timor mortis conturbat me].

(6)

O dethe, to drede pou ert ouer all;
 Py myghtis me marryt euer among;
 For hooso wraskle *with* pe he schall haue a fall,
 Be he neuer [so] styff ne strang.
 Was neuer man borne fre ne prall,
 Where [he] neuer so large ne long,
 But he knewe hymselfe mortall;
 'Timor mortis' myght be is song.
 Per was neuer ladd pat leuyt so long
 Pat ne deyyt or dede schall be;
 Perfore, bycauce Y haue lyuyd wrang,
 'Timor mortis conturbat] me.'

(7)

Per is no pyng pat euer God made
 More *certeyn* to vs pan oure depe is,
 But more *vn*certeyne pyng none is yhadd
 Pan pe ourre off depe to vs, ywysse.
 Owt of pys wordyll all we schall wade;
 Whe ne wot *hodur* to woo or to blyse;
 Perfore whe aught neuer to be glad
 Yff whe wolde hertely penke on pys.
 The ende off synne trewly dethe is,
 But dethe off synners werst payd is he;
 Perfore whe may syng, pat lyuyt amysse,
 'Timor mortis conturbat me.'

f. 146 v.

(8)

3e zeng f[re]sche folke, behold and see
 How sore dethe schall vs all dystrene;
 Wanne zowthe is passyd, panne farewell he;
 He may nat be reclaym[d] agene.
 To oure natur pis is dowte:
 Doole, dolour, *and* dethe is pay[n]e;
 zowthe wold besy vs dethe to fle;
 Ywysse, oure labour is all in vayne.
 Pys is a reson off Job *certeyne*:
 'Peccantem me cotidie,'
 For in pys wyse he dede compleyn:
 'Timor mortis conturbat me.'

(9)

'Timor mortis conturbat me,'
 Þis is in Englis tong to say,
 'The drede off dethe distrowlyt me.'
 Wanne Cryst is baner schall display
 And deme schall dowltes euery degre
 Afftir oure dedys at *domusday*,
 Miserere mei, *Domine*,
 Pat for vs suffryd on Goud Fryday.
 Mayde *and* modir, for vs þou pray
 Onto þy Sone þat starffe on tre,
 So þat whe neuer haue cause to say,
 'Timor mortis conturbat me.'

The second text of the poem is in Lord Harlech's MS. Porkington 10, ff. 195r.-198r., here indicated by P. Only those variants which appreciably affect the sense of a passage are here recorded.

The order of the stanzas in P. is: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 7, 5, 6, 9.

Stanza 1, l. 4, *strayte*] MS. *strrayte* l. 5, wit and vnstabilte] P. *with mutabilitie*. l. 10] P. At þe last dethe com I dyd hym se.

Stanza 2, l. 1, drede] P. dent. l. 5, prosperite] MS. *sprosperite*. l. 8] P. Dep folowip whiper þat euer we torne.

Stanza 3, l. 3, none] P. barne. styff] P. stronge. l. 8, Affter oure werkis] P. Oute of þis worlde. l. 9, how Is] P. I drede þe. l. 10, schall ryghtwysse] P. hit is ryzte schal.

Stanza 4, l. 4, no man] P. neuer. l. 5, And in] P. Whereeto. l. 6, *travayle*] MS. *travayle*. l. 10] P. As hart myne why nelt þou glad *and* lusti be.

Stanza 5, l. 3, Wham he hettyt] P. Whan dethe smytyþ þan. l. 9, no manis] P. þat owre. so] P. not so. l. 10] P. To lyue algate in mortalite.

Stanza 6, l. 2, þy myghtis] P. þat. ll. 4, 5] MS. *transposes*. ll. 4, 6] P. *transposes*. l. 7, mortall] P. verrelly immortale. l. 9, ladd] P. lorde. l. 11, Y] P. We. l. 12, Timor] P. We may sey tymor.

Stanza 7, l. 7, þerfore whe] P. þat man. l. 8, Yff whe wolde] P. þat schold allway. l. 9] P. *omits*. l. 10, payd] P. *omits*. l. 11] P. For he þat louyth always *and* dothe amys. l. 12, Timor] P. May sey tymor.

Stanza 8, l. 4, reclaymi[d] P. releuyd. l. 5, þis is] P. no. l. 6, Doole] P. Siknesse *and*. *and*] P. is. l. 7, zowthe wold besy] P. And tho we wolde cast. l. 10, Peccantem] MS. Pectantem.

Stanza 9, l. 2, say] P. Men. l. 5, And deme schall] P. For demyd we schal be dowteles. l. 6, Afftir] P. All. at *domusday*] P. þis is no nay. l. 9] P. Mary moder mylde to zow I pray. l. 10, Onto] P. To pray. l. 12] P. *repeats*.

At end: MS. Amen for charite. MS. writes all except the last five lines as prose.

Notes.

This poem is No. 2325 in Brown's *Register of Middle English Religious and Didactic Verse*, vol. II (Oxford, 1920), where it is entered under its second line. For texts of the other 'Timor mortis' poems see Frank A. Patterson, *The Middle English Penitential Lyric* (New York, 1911), Nos. 35-38, and Ella K. Whiting, *The Poems of John Audelay* (E.E.T.S., Or. Ser. No. 184, London, 1931), No. 51. The two texts here presented are listed by Patterson as different poems.

Stanza 1, ll. 7, 8: 'Stage' was a recognised term for a step or station on the rim of Fortune's wheel which was conceived as being occupied by the men who were the sport of the goddess. Cf. Dunbar, 'Lucina Shynnyng in Silence of the Night,' l. 18 (*Poems*, ed. J. Small, Edinburgh, 1893, p. 149), and *The Kingis Quair*, stanza 9, l. 2 (ed. W. W. Skeat, S.T.S., Edinburgh, 1911).

Stanza 8, l. 10 (B, stanza 5): This phrase, like 'Timor mortis conturbat me,' is not actually from Job, but is apparently attributed to him because of its proximity in the service to an extract from Job xvii which forms *Lectio VII* in the Thrd Nocturne of the *Officium Mortuorum* in the Sarum Breviary. The response to that *lectio* runs: 'Peccantem me quotidie et non poenitentem timor mortis conturbat me. Quia in inferno nulla est redemptio miserere mei Deus et salva me.'

RICHARD L. GREENE.

CAMBRIDGE.

'SPILLER'S JESTS.'

At the close of his biographical sketch of James Spiller, Mr W. J. Lawrence writes that after his death, 'Two modest shilling pamphlets were issued, the one containing sundry details of Spiller's life, by Akerby, the painter, and a portrait after Laguerre; the other his 'merry jests, diverting songs and entertaining tales¹.' Joseph Knight, in his account of Spiller in the *D.N.B.*, gives *The Life of Mr James Spiller* as an authority, but of the *Jests* he says 'the chief recommendation of the volume is its scarcity.' As a matter of fact, the *Jests* seems to have been merely the *Life* with a new title-page, as the following manuscript note in the

¹ 'A Player-Friend of Hogarth,' *The Elizabethan Playhouse and Other Studies*, Second Series, Stratford-upon-Avon, 1913, p. 226.

Huntington Library copy of *Spiller's Jests* shows: 'It would seem that Spiller's *Life* was not an attractive title—the publisher therefore cancelled the first title, and substituted the present one—because in every thing but the titles the two tracts are precisely the same¹.' It seems probable that neither Knight nor Lawrence was actually acquainted with the *Jests*. Indeed, although Mr Lawrence refers to Akerby, the author of the *Life* (and the *Jests*), he cites only from Samuel Ireland's *Graphic Illustrations of Hogarth* (1794), a work which I have not seen, but which, to judge by Mr Lawrence's account, draws heavily upon Akerby's sketch. Certainly Akerby, whatever his faults, is our chief authority for the life of this clever comedian.

Perhaps Spiller's chief title to fame is the fact that he was the original Mat o' the Mint in *The Beggar's Opera*. Mr Lawrence records this distinction, but, strangely, ignores Spiller's letter to Polly Peachum 'upon the Account of the unreasonable Success of Mr Gay's *Beggar's Opera*, which he affirms was stole from Mr Bullock's. . . *The Woman's Revenge, or The Match in Newgate*.' The letter, in prose and verse, is signed 'Peter Padwell,' which in *Woman's Revenge* is the name of a condemned felon acted by Spiller². I quote the 'Letter of Mr Spiller's to Miss Polly Peachum' from the *Jests*:

To Pretty Miss Polly Peachum.

Pretty Polly say,
What makes Jonny Gay,
To call, to call, his Newgate-Scenes,
The Beggar's Opera?
Silly wretched Man,
Such a Flame to Fan,
To think of quenching Lover's Pains,
That any Dungeon can.

But hold me, dear Duck, whither am I running in Musical Notes, when my only Design is to Forewarn and admonish thee in Mournful-guise of the great Danger we are in, from this Damn'd Thieve's Opera we are so merry about. Pol—pray retain in your Memory what the honest Cobler says in Sir Fopling Flutter—Ale and History Master &c. for which Reason, take notice, my Girl, if we are put into the Crown Office, and after that into Jail, for the Sins of other People, I here enter my Protest in Form against these Treasonable Scenes,

As they are fully prov'd to be,
By Phil Harmonicus's Key.

In the Days of that immortal Stuart, King James the First, there liv'd one Mr. John Marston, who wrote Eight Plays. One of which, call'd *The Dutch Curtezian*; was Printed

¹ The title is as follows: *Spiller's Jests, or The Life and Pleasant Adventures of the Late Celebrated Comedian Mr. James Spiller, Containing His Merry Jests, Diverting Songs, and Entertaining Tales*, London: Printed for H. Cook, near Water-Lane, and S. Hester, under White-Fryars Gateway, Fleet-Street.

² W. E. Schultz, *Gay's Beggar's Opera, Its Contents, History and Influence*, New Haven, 1923, pp. 32, 168–171, says that the author, who accused Gay of plagiarism, was an anonymous hack-writer.

in the Year 1605, and eight and Twenty Years afterwards, 1633, it was reviv'd with great Success, under the Title of *The Revenge · Or, A Match in Newgate*.—And in the Year 1715, being the Second Year of King George the First, (God bless his Memory) our dear Brother Mr. Christopher Bullock, Revived this Comedy, and call'd it *A Woman's Revenge · or a Match in Newgate*.

And Now you see, in the First Year of King George the Second, that Mr. John Gay, who turns the Transactions of all the World into Fables, has metamorphosed Mr. John Marston's Dutch Curtezan, into the Dutchess of ---- and your Mother Acts the Part, and does not prove her Marriage.

Ev'ry Page Gay has writ,
Tho' 'tis stuff'd up with Metre;
Points out P---y and Parliament,
God bless the Speaker.

In short the Truth ought to be told, our Brother Bullock's *Match in Newgate* is a harmless, inoffensive Farce,

And Dedicated was to me,
As you may very plainly see.

The *Beggar's Opera* Mr. Gay stole from Mr. Bullock, who only borrowed it of Mr. Marston, and the Law says, The Receiver is as bad as the Thief: Besides it is most certainly a Label against the K---g and G---t,

And we shall all be soused for our Folly,
Lockit, Macheath, Padwell, Peachum, Polly,
By other Folks Crime, Let us learn to Beware,
And keep our own Noddles, Girl, out of the Snare.

Paddington.
St. David's Day,
1728.

PETER PADWELL.

Perhaps James's alarm was not quite genuine. At any rate, he seems to have kept his own noddle out of the snare. He died February 7, 1730 (not 1729, as Mr Lawrence says, for his letter is dated March 1, 1728/9), a week after having been seized with apoplexy while acting in Lewis Theobald's *The Rape of Proserpine*.

GEORGE W. WHITING.

HOUSTON, TEXAS, U.S.A.

AN UNRECOGNISED IDIOM IN MIDDLE FRENCH.

In *Pantagruel*, chap. xxix (ed. Plattard, *Les Textes Français*, p. 144), the mace of the giant Loup Garou is described as being studded with 'treize poinctes de dyamans, dont la moindre estoit aussi grosse comme la plus grande cloche de Nostre-Dame de Paris (il s'en falloit par aventure l'espesseur d'un ongle, ou au plus, que je ne mente, d'un doz de ces cousteaux qu'on appelle *coupe aureille*; mais pour un petit, ne avant ne arriere).' The last phrase is explained in the notes to the edition mentioned above as meaning 'Sans ajouter, ni sur la face avant, ni sur la face

arrière, la plus petite épaisseur.' In the critical edition of Rabelais published under the direction of M. Abel Lefranc (iv, p. 295), a note by M. Plattard gives the same rendering, with the remark: 'Cette affectation de précision dans un sujet invraisemblable est un effet comique fréquent chez R.'

While the general validity of this statement is unquestionable, it is hardly appropriate in this case; for the meaning of the phrase in question is almost the opposite of that assigned to it by M. Plattard. It expresses a lordly dismissal, as being quite immaterial, of any such slight discrepancy in the measurements as has just been indicated; and this in the context is surely of a more humorous effect than would be a further straining of the *procédé* of exaggerated precision.

A similar expression occurs in *Troilus* (*Nouvelles françaises du XVe s.*, éd. Moland et d'Héricault, p. 250): 'Mais de tous les songes...ne donroige pas une pomme; car pour eulx ne plus avant ne plus arrière.' The editors remark. 'Tous nos manuscrits sont d'accord pour donner cette phrase, qui laisse pourtant à désirer un verbe. Il faut sans doute sous-entendre: je ne yroie, ou comprendre: cela n'avance ni ne recule rien.' The last suggestion is very near the mark.

A commoner variant is '*pour...ne plus ne moins*,' examples of which are:

Dit la dame: 'Or vos aesiez;
De ses diz ne vos esmaiez,
Que por ses diz ne plus ne mains,
Par semblant est li sires grains.'

(Montaiglon et Raynaud, *Fabliaux*, vi, p. 100.)

Au moins, dit le Roy, permettez qu'elle soit accompagnée de ceste damoyse, car elle ne seroit trop honnestement seule entre tant d'hommes. Et bien, respondit le chevalier, pour une femme ne plus ny moins.

(*Amadis de Gaule*, l. I, éd. Vaganay, p. 383.)

'Mais voulés vous venir gaigner les pardons? dist il.—Et par ma foy (je luy responds), je ne suis grand pardonneur en ce monde icy; je ne sçay si je le seray en l'autre. Bien, allons, au nom de Dieu, pour un denier ny plus, ny moins.'

(Rabelais, *Pantagruel*, chap. xvii (ed. Plattard, p. 89).)

Thevot. ...Comme fus-tu si fort hardy
De la poursuyvre jusques a mort.
Colin. Mon père, j'ay bien faict plus fort,
Et pour cela, ne plus ne moins,
J'ai bien autre chose en mains.

(*Ancien Théâtre Français*, II, p. 397.)

In all six cases the meaning of the expression, though sometimes slightly obscured by the punctuation, is clearly '...is immaterial, of no importance; is neither here nor there; makes no difference either way.' The idiom doubtless originated in an ellipsis, perhaps '*pour...on ne va ne*

avant ne arriere¹, *on n'a ne plus ne moms*, ' (*pour* with the negation having adversative force as in *pourtant*); but it is evident that by the date of our earliest example it was felt as a form of expression complete in itself, and that as such it remained in general use for a considerable period.

T. B. W. REID.

MANCHESTER.

¹ It is hardly probable that the original unabridged form of the expression is that contained in Villon's lines (*Testament*, XVI):

Les mons ne bougent de leurs lieux
Pour ung povre, n'avant n'arriere.

But in writing them he may well have had the elliptic idiom in mind

REVIEWS

A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue from the Twelfth Century to the end of the Seventeenth. By SIR WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE. (Parts I-II, A-Berising.) Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, London: H. Milford. 1931-2. xi + 240 pp. Each 18s.

The decision of the founders of *The New English Dictionary* to exclude all English words believed to be obsolete by 1200 has brought many inconveniences, not the least being the lack of a complete etymological treatment of the Old English vocabulary—a lack which is only beginning to be supplied by Professor Holthausen¹. Accordingly, at a meeting addressed by Sir William Craigie some years ago in Edinburgh, I expressed a hope that the material collected for the two Scots dictionaries then in preparation would be pooled and would appear under a single alphabet. That hope, which must have been shared by many, was doomed to disappointment. Eighteen months ago appeared Part I of Sir William's work, which was closely followed by the first part of Mr Grant's *Scottish National Dictionary*. The line was drawn at 1700, by which date the Middle Scots phase had passed and the literary revival of the eighteenth century had not yet begun with Allan Ramsay.

Scots, and especially Middle Scots, differs from Standard English in vocabulary as in phonology and flexion. It is true that the Celtic element is scarcely more prominent than in English, but the 'Auld Alliance' brought in a good many French words not found in Chaucer or the fifteenth-century writers. Even more important is the Latin element, partly due to imitation of the Rhétoriqueurs (from which Skelton, in England, was not exempt), but in the main to the influence of the Civil Law on Scots life and thought. Much of the material was unpublished or unknown when the *N.E.D.* began to appear in 1884, and Sir William has drawn not merely on the storehouse of the Scottish Text Society, but has incorporated a great deal of new material from records (beginning at the end of the eleventh century) and MS. sources, which will be found listed in his Register of Titles. To them may be added a MS. collection of Scots proverbs which is now preserved in the strong-room of Edinburgh University and was briefly noted in an appendix to the Scottish Text Society edition of David Fergusson's collection.

Sir William is a prince of lexicographers. His material is set out clearly and with great economy of space. The fullness of his illustrations is beyond all praise; rarely does one miss a familiar reference and then one can be pretty sure that the use in question has been illustrated from some other source. It is ungrateful work gleaning where Sir William has shorn, but I note a couple of head-words have been omitted:

¹ The usefulness of Clark Hall's references to the *N.E.D.* in the case of O.E. words which fell out of use during the M.E. period has not been sufficiently recognised by those who habitually consult Bosworth-Toller.

alblastrye, *n.* The practice of shooting with an arbalest (*var.* albalest). *Kingis Quair*, st. 156 (the elk for alblastrye = 'the elk whose hide is a protection against crossbow quarrels').

art-magician, *n.* Practiser of the magic art. Dunbar, iv, l. 37 (Art, magicianis, and astrologgis), where the punctuation of the Chapman and Myllar print is clearly at fault.

Occasionally the brevity with which the definitions are stated leads to some lack of preciseness. For example in Henryson, *Test. Cress.*, 494, as in one or two of the examples quoted, *Almous deid* is used in a concrete sense. In most, if not all, of the quotations given, *amble*, *v.*, is used in the old technical sense (*N.E.D.* 1), now almost obsolete in this country. *Bere*, at any rate in the northern counties of Scotland, was not precisely what the Southron would understand by 'barley.'

One must add a tribute to the accuracy with which the proofs have been read. Misprints are rare, but under *bancour* the bracket [*B.* bankers] within the quotation from Henryson, *Test. Cress.*, 417, can scarcely be correct; *B* is presumably a misprint for *K* (= *Kinaston MS.*).

Subsequent parts of this important work will be dealt with in convenient batches.

BRUCE DICKINS.

LEEDS.

Beowulfstudien. Von JOHANNES HOOPS. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1932. viii + 140 pp. 7.50 M.

Hoops' *Beowulfstudien* is preliminary to a projected commentary on the poem, by way of lightening the ship and allowing room for more detailed discussion. Here he deals with a large number of passages with the aim of settling the text or meaning, and includes among them many of the more troublesome. The discussion is valuable not only for his own contribution, but because he gives in a convenient form a brief critical account of some recent attempts to elucidate the points in question. His comments are always acute and suggestive, his arguments persuasive and occasionally convincing; and if the critical part seems more valuable than the constructive, that is the fate which attends most scholars handling difficult and controversial subjects. He rightly approves the practice of modern editors in avoiding emendation except under pressure of necessity, and he urges adherence to the traditional text in all cases where forms can be paralleled not only from dialect texts but even from late MSS. on the ground that the recorded spelling does or may represent an actual linguistic fact. Not all scholars will be willing to go the whole way with him in this matter, and some may continue to regard with a degree of scepticism phonological developments not adequately documented, or reduction and confusion of endings assigned to the popular speech, recalling that *Beowulf*, whatever else it is, was never 'spoken Anglo-Saxon.'

The study falls into two parts, a group of 'Abhandlungen' dealing in some detail with sixteen selected passages or points, and a second part

handling more briefly some fifty or sixty more. Of the former the longest, apart from the first which is a discussion of general principles, and the twelfth which is a series of comments on the Finnsburg episode, are a discussion of ll. 303–6 (*ferh* = 'boar' and *grimmon* is dat. pl.), 489 f. (*meotu* is an abstract related to *metigan* and in pl. = 'Gedanken'), 769 (on *ealuscerwen* where there is no real decision but he points to O.H.G. *gnskerian* = privare), 1931 f. (where he proposes to read *Mōðþrýð ð wæg*), and 2999 ff. (emending *Scyldingas* to *scyldwigan*), the last being an extended form of the essay in *Britannica*, pp. 26–30. It will be evident even from this short indication that this book is one which no student of *Beowulf* can afford to miss. On many of the points discussed Hoops seems to be in the right; at all events the present writer shares his view. Such are *glæde*, l. 58 ('herrlich'), *horngeap*, l. 82 ('weitgiebelig'), *swā*, l. 92 ('soweit'), *orcnēas*, l. 112 ('höllische Dämonengespenster'), *gāstbona*, l. 177 ('Geistes Toter'), *word oðer fand*, etc., l. 870, where his punctuation is to be preferred, also his explanation of *oðer*, if he means by 'neue' that the *scop* was not repeating from memory but making anew from the old material, and of *sōðe gebunden* 'in guten alliterierenden Versen.' Just, too, is his contention that there is only one 'Preislied' in ll. 867–915, that *gewēold*, l. 1534, depends on *nemne*, that *fela-fricgende*, l. 2105, has a perfective sense, and that *swefað*, l. 2457, should be retained; further that *seldan hwaēr*, l. 2029, is a phrasal unity, a view which is substantiated by the use in the M. Scots *Bunk of Alexander* (ed. Ritchie, Scott. Text Soc.), II, 3702, *Sic ane chekker that neuer ar | Was sene ane better seildin quare = Li eschesquiers fu biars, onques mieudres ne fu*. On many further points he is interesting and persuasive, on *wordum wriclan*, l. 366, 'reden,' *lufan*, l. 1728 and *lufen*, l. 2886, 'das liebe Heim,' *soleða*, l. 2367 (on the etymology), *unglāw*, l. 2564, preferring *unslāw* to *angl(ē)aw* (but *glēaw* could be used of the eyes in O.E., as we speak of sharp eyes or sharp sight, and that is presumably a transferred sense), *wordrihta*, l. 2631, 'Zurechtweisung.' On the other hand, several of his suggestions fail to bring conviction, such as, to name a few, *hringiren*, l. 322 = *byrne*, *mæste cræfte*, l. 2181, acc. with *cræft* as a fem. noun, *gūðeræðs*, l. 2356, as a compound, *ēce eorðreced*, l. 2719, as subject. These and other even more interesting points like his suggested reading *Mōðþrýð ð* cannot be discussed in detail in a notice like the present, though the temptation is strong.

Two points may, however, be selected for a word of criticism. Hoops translates *lange āhte*, l. 31, 'so lange...der liebe Landesfürst *Angehörige hatte* (mit denen er sprechen, denen er befehlen konnte),' and he supports his rendering especially by reference to *gelenge*, l. 2732, and O.H.G. *gilang* 'verwandt, affinis,' *gilangēr* 'Verwandter,' etc., citing also with approval Kock's explanation of *andlongne eorl*, l. 2695, 'den anverwandten Helden.' Nevertheless, it appears that the idea of affinity in *gelenge*, *gilang(ēr)* resides in the prefix as, for example, in *gelic*. If *lengē* is really used in this sense, which may be doubted, then it is in the same way as *līc* is later employed for *gelic*, and it is extremely hazardous to assume any such use in *Beowulf*. As to *andlongne eorl*, it cannot be separated from such phrases as *andlangne dæg*, *ondlonge niht*,

which really mean while day (night) was with them, so long as it lasted, i.e., the livelong day (night). Not enough note is given to *anlangcempa* recorded in Bosworth and Toller's *Suppl.* (s.v. *andlangcempa*) and the explanation there, and it rather appears as if *andlongne eorl* means simply 'the noble at his side.'

The other point concerns ll. 2032-6, where Hoops' punctuation and interpretation do not persuade. He makes *hē*, l. 2034 = Ingeld, and ll. 2035, 6, separated from the preceding by a colon, indicate the situation which gives offence, viz., 'die Gefolgsleute der Danen, die (dort) bewirteten Mannschaften; an ihnen leuchten die Erbstücke der Alten.' It is, in effect, an attempt to save *biwenede*, which is most likely beyond salvation. In any event it seems clear that *hē*, l. 2034 = *dryhtbearn Dena*, l. 2035, and that both refer to *se fæmnan þegn*, l. 2059, equivalent to *comes copulae carnalis* in Bede's account of Paulinus (II, 9), where we have a parallel case of a princess being married into a foreign court and conducted thither by a retinue. There is a good deal said about a sword in the sequel, and swords were important symbols in early betrothal and nuptial ceremonies. Cf. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, 2nd ed., pp. 167 ff. Is it too bold a conjecture that this *þegn* led the princess into Ingeld's hall bearing a naked sword, a ceremonial entry comparable with the Frisian custom at the home-coming of the bride, *erecta puero sponsum praeceunte machaera*? If that were so the situation and the resentment of the Heathobards are easily explicable, and the action of the Danes in permitting the *byre nāthwylces* to carry that particular sword, if not deliberate provocation, was at all events singularly tactless.

R. GIRVAN.

GLASGOW.

The Ballad of Tradition. By GORDON HALL GEROULD. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1932. viii + 312 pp. 12s. 6d.

'*Edward*' and '*Sven i Rosengård*.' By ARCHER TAYLOR. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1931. xii + 112 pp. 11s. 6d.

These two books, though of very different value, may be considered together as representing two kinds of ballad criticism, intensive study of one ballad and its variants, and a survey of the field. Professor Gerould, that is to say, modestly calls his volume a survey, but it is more than that: his 'new appraisal of our present knowledge about ballads' and the conclusions which he draws about their history, his interpretation, after thirty years of attention to them, of what seem to him to be their more important characteristics, cannot safely be overlooked by any student. In a book as interesting as it is scholarly, certain points should be especially noted: the insistence on the importance of ballad tunes (cf. especially pp. 73 ff. and 124 ff.), the development—independent, it would appear—of Don Ramon Menéndez Pidal's argument on the improvement, as well as the deterioration, of ballads by the process of passing through tradition (especially pp. 169-181), and the strong

argument in favour of a 'tradition of artistry' in both words and tunes, whose presence would help to account for the greatest triumphs of the ballads, and whose absence explains the faults of some of the later American examples (cf. especially pp. 184 ff., 224 ff. and 263-4). The opinions on these problems, as well as on those other problems of origin which have sometimes led to heat and fury, are put forward with a reasonableness and persuasiveness which ought to calm the most excited supporter of an exclusive theory. It is only on some minor points that I would suggest a difference of opinion or a desire for amplification. Is there anything surprising, for example, in the representation of fairies as being of ordinary size, not easily distinguishable from mortals (pp. 142-3)? The fairies of folklore are not the same as the fantastic creatures of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (though even there Titania could take Bottom's asshead on her lap), and there are good reasons, as Dr Margaret Murray has shown, why there should be 'little to differentiate them from men.' Again, it would be interesting to have Professor Gerould's opinion on the relation between the *Corpus Christi* ballad and the secular version preserved by James Hogg in the notes to *Sir David Graeme*: 'The dove flew east, the dove flew west.' Is Hogg's version a falling off from the original, or is the other, with its weaker nineteenth and twentieth-century descendants, either an instance of a ballad refashioned for a clerical audience, or an extreme instance first of improvement by oral tradition on an original version like Hogg's and then of deterioration? Finally, is it possible that the *Twelfth Day* poem, which seems to be, in Dr Greg's words, 'a thirteenth-century literary imitation of a popular ballad,' may throw some light on the problem of *Auld Maitland*? Could that with its odd linguistic survivals, be not, as Lang once thought, a seventeenth-century imitation, nor, as others have unjustly supposed, a late eighteenth-century forgery, but also originally a thirteenth-century literary imitation?

A note by Professor Gerould on *Edward* (p. 50) leads to the problem which Mr Archer Taylor considers in his study of the English, Scandinavian and Finnish versions of the ballad. 'One wonders,' writes Professor Gerould, 'whether the copy furnished Percy by Lord Hailes (Child B) does not preserve the earlier form of the story....It will be noted that the continental versions say nothing about the mother's guilt, which is an essential feature of *Edward*, though rather senseless if the brothers quarrel suddenly about some trifling matter.' That is the point which Mr Archer Taylor misses: unless the mother has egged her son on to either parricide or fratricide—her guilt being brought out by the final stanza in both the English versions—the ballad is no more than a variant, interesting merely for its dialogue form, of *The Two Brothers*. It is barely possible that this is the truth, that the ballad gives us an unparalleled example of traditional improvement in England, the taking of a pathetic theme of accidental fratricide and gradually heightening the agony, first in *Son Davie* and then in *Edward*—a tragic poem unequalled of its kind. But when we note that the ballads which omit the theme of the mother's guilt exaggerate the ballad commonplaces for 'never'

found in *Son Davie* (not in *Edward*), and continue progressively exaggerating them to the point, as Child noted, of 'a palpable tendency to parody,' the explanation must seem highly improbable, and Mr Taylor's preference of these versions as nearer to the 'original' story must seem surprising. But his arguments are throughout surprising. Though he will not admit that *Edward* is nearest to the 'original' story, he insists that the ballad must have originated in England and passed to Scandinavia, because the *Edward* version is courtly, whereas the Scandinavian, Finnish and modern American versions have brought the family down in the world. One would have expected to find him arguing for a lost Scandinavian 'courtly' version—which may, indeed, for all we know, have existed, and may have been more like *Edward* than any extant version, or may, on Mr Taylor's premisses, have been the original from which *Edward* diverged. Throughout the study, Mr Taylor does not give proof of such clear judgment as is needed for a comparative study of this kind, such, for example, as Don Ramon Menéndez Pidal showed in his examination of *Gerineldo*. But it is of use to have additional texts of parallels to *Edward* and *Son Davie*, and for these we should be grateful to Mr Taylor.

EDITH C. BATHO.

LONDON.

Die Politische Schulung des englischen Volkes. Von HERBERT SCHÖFFLER (Hefte zur Englandkunde, v). Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1931. 38 pp. 1 M. 25.

Die Anfänge des Puritanismus. Versuch einer Deutung der englischen Reformation. Von HERBERT SCHÖFFLER (Kolner anglistische Arbeiten, XIV). Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1932. 177 pp. 5 M.

In these studies of their national history for the edification of contemporary Germany, English readers will find God's custom of revealing truth first to his Englishmen demonstrated strangely. The earlier, and the slighter, of the two essays points the moral of the fact that 'zwischen dem Ende der englischen Leibeigenschaft und der Vergebung hochster politischer Rechte an den letzten Volksgenossen ein halbes Jahrtausend liegt—bei uns zwei Generationen' (p. 36). English political sophistication and honesty are traced to the political tradition which survived the extension of the suffrage in the nineteenth century, and to the growth of religious minorities which have taught all classes to think independently about abstract questions and to defend the rights of minorities with a shrewd determination to enforce their own claims, tempered by respect for the position of their adversaries. Professor Schöffler's esteem for those contemporary English politicians who have brought the experience and the world view which they gained as young men in dissenting pulpits or lecture halls into Parliament carries him to the apocalyptic conclusion that, 'Aus dem Begriffsgefüge des Calvinismus arbeiten solche Menschen an der rationalen Zimmerung der Welt. Der Gedanke des Zusammen-

schlusses aller Völker, so wie er in unseren Tagen Gestalt erhalten hat, ist eine angelsächsische Idee, seine Basis die Stadt Calvins' (p. 32).

A reader who turns to *Die Anfänge des Puritanismus* will be disappointed if he expects to find either Anglophil or Protestant prejudices. God's revelation of truth to his Englishmen is made to appear an inevitable irony of history. The essay focuses upon the attempt to prove that from Henry VIII's divorce of Katherine until the accession of James all the forces at work in England conspired unconsciously to create the unforeseen blessing, Dissent. Although the essay is written strictly to that thesis, the author's single-minded conviction of it makes him quite impartial with all the evidence. In themselves, taken separately, few, if any, of his points are novel or doubtful; and the liveliness of his attacks often gives the reader the sensation of watching a sham battle. No one doubts that Henry was innocent of reforming purpose when he became supreme head of the English Church and proclaimed the immutability of Catholic dogma; or that the prevailing religious impulses among the people under Henry were reactionary; or that few, if any, Englishmen in the sixteenth century conceived of any other outcome to the religious controversy than an established church such as resulted in Germany. A few French scholars may, perhaps, dissent, but among Anglo-Saxons there should be unanimous approval of Professor Schoffler's onslaught upon whomsoever 'die Tatsache des Puritanismus in England rasch erklären zu können meint mit einem jener gedanken-tötenden Hinweise auf die übergeordnete Kategorie des "Volkscharakters"' (p. 145). With perfect impartiality we are shown the forces—economic, social, and personal—which blindly contributed to the birth of that tolerance of minorities (already an unacknowledged reality under Elizabeth) which Professor Schöffler calls the 'Genius Terrae' (p. 141). The summary of Cranmer's influence is masterly. Beyond that point the analysis is less unhurried and searching, but there is no decline in the mastery of the basic evidence. Throughout the essay good use is made of a very wide acquaintance with local records, in Essex and Northamptonshire particularly, as well as in London; and in the final chapter the interest of the material adduced from the sources overshadows that of the climax of the argument.

MERRITT Y. HUGHES.

SAFFRON WALDEN, ESSEX.

Thomas Lodge: The History of an Elizabethan. By N. BURTON PARADISE. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1932. vii + 254 pp. 16s.

The preface to this study remarks that the lack of attention given to Lodge's history may perhaps be accounted for by the odd mixture in such of his writings as we possess of the conflicting elements of conservative and radical ideas. Fortunately this rather human confusion has not dissuaded Professor Paradise from the task of portraying Lodge against the background of his own time and in his significance for our own. Since

Lodge's unquiet career, with its changes from poverty to security, from the Protestant to the Roman faith, from law to literature and finally medicine, is to an unusual degree representative of the Elizabethan age, this readable and scholarly narrative of its progress is especially welcome.

In almost every literary genre Lodge was an early experimenter, often a successful one, and experiments were scarcely less frequent in his life than they were in his writings. For some reason, however, Professor Paradise cannot bring himself to believe that Lodge was either profligate in his youth or 'wholly decayd' in his purse as the Court of Chancery order proclaimed in 1594. Such jealousy for a poet's reputation is rare enough nowadays, in all conscience: there is some irony in the probability that not a few readers will find it excessive here. At one or two points in the biography Professor Paradise appears to be on most uncertain ground. Writing of a period in which the poet's history can hardly be traced, he declares (p. 37) that Lodge is described in lawsuit dating from September 1585, as of West Bilney, Norfolk. Now this identification might be admissible if we were given any other reason for associating Lodge with West Bilney. Unfortunately we are not. Nor is it reassuring to find that the evidence upon which the argument is seemingly founded is that one Thomas Lodge appeared as a witness on behalf of 'his friend Leonard Shapton.' We may reasonably demand more than this bare statement before we are satisfied that Shapton was an acquaintance of our Thomas Lodge, yet his name occurs nowhere else in the book. The difficulty is still further increased by a footnote reference (p. 37, note 51) to Star Chamber documents, upon which the case depends, which is obviously incomplete or inaccurate. With a somewhat similar rashness Professor Paradise ventures to identify (p. 57, note 13) as Thomas Lodge's the hand of one of the documents in the suit against his elder brother: it may without doubt be taken as a clerk's. A point of considerable significance is raised by the theory, which does not entirely lack evidence to support it, that Lodge's voyage to the Canaries took place three years earlier than is generally supposed. As a consequence of dating this journey in 1585, Professor Paradise is inclined, though with some hesitation, to put back the date of *The Wounds of Civil War* to 1586, and of *A Looking Glass for London* to 1587. There is nothing inherently improbable in either of these changes.

More than one half of Professor Paradise's book is devoted to Lodge as a man of letters and a dramatist, whilst his three appendices deal respectively with the wills of the Lodge family, the much debated question of Lodge's borrowings, and the bibliography of his writings. The student will be grateful for this discerning estimate of Lodge's work, for though little is added to the sum of our knowledge it is not too much to say that Lodge has seldom received juster treatment.

W. P. BARRETT.

LONDON.

The Text of King Lear. By MADELEINE DORAN. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. 148 pp. 9s. 6d.

The textual history of *Lear* is sown with difficulties. What was the copy for Q 1 of 1608? Of F? And what is the relationship between F and the two QQ (Q 2 was issued in 1619 with the date 1608)? There have been various explanations of these problems, and even after a book so good as this further various explanations will no doubt be hazarded.

Dr Doran reconstructs the history of the text in this way. First there was Shakespeare's MS. This was transcribed for use in the playhouse and then went to Nathaniel Butler as copy for Q 1. The transcript was revised at some points and became the basis for F.

Concerning Q 1, one might begin by asking whether it is a bad 'good' quarto or a good 'bad' quarto. Dr Doran cannot agree with Schmidt and Sir E. K. Chambers in regarding it as the work of a stenographer. She ably supports her view that Q 1 came straight from Shakespeare's MS. If so, that MS. was certainly not commendable for its blotlessness. The compositor of Q 1, for instance, made such havoc with the aligning of the verse, that one has to postulate foul papers so foul that it became impossible for him to make out line lengths. (I cannot agree with the *Times Literary Supplement* reviewer of this book that Shakespeare, when he wrote *Lear*, did not know whether he was writing prose or verse.) But perhaps, after all, there may have been an expert stenographer, unlike the one of Heywood's experience, and one who may have attended several performances in the cause of accuracy. After the stenographer would come the compositor, making a second layer of inaccuracy, misreading following mishearing. These two sources of error might together explain Q 1. Or again, if the copy were Shakespeare's original MS. and were so badly blotted, might not some of it have been dictated to the compositor in the printing house?

Dr Doran 'proves,' as she puts it, that F came from a revised transcript of Q 1, and that the compositor occasionally had recourse to Q 2. (The agreements at certain places between F and Q 2 Dr Doran puts down mainly to their both being printed at the same house, William Jaggard's, within four years of each other.) I think she may be said to prove her point in so far as the revised transcript is concerned. Her strongest argument is that Q 1 could not physically have undergone ink correction to the extent required. It is conceivable that an interleaved copy of a printed quarto might be used where extensive correction was needed. This would explain how errors in Q 1 might be retained in F. Interleaving seems to have been an occasional practice, in law books at least, even earlier than this date. The British Museum copy of *Les Tenures du monsieur Littleton* (1579), as Col. F. Isaac has pointed out to me, has interleaves which appear to be contemporary. Dr E. Wambaugh's bibliography in his *Littleton's Tenures in English* (1903) mentions an interleaved copy of the 1588 edition in Lincoln's Inn. The copy of the 1608 edition in the library of University College, London, was interleaved before 1633. The earliest interleaved non-legal book I know of is Anthony Wood's copy of Gore's book on heraldry interleaved in 1668.

Dr Doran is on less certain ground when she leaves conjecture for her 'positive proof,' her *catalogue raisonné* of misprints committed by the F compositor and due to misreading MS. not print. There are one or two misprints which do seem to require this explanation. But Dr Doran makes no allowance for other possible causes. 'Rencag' (Q 1) and 'Reuenge' (F), for instance, may be due simply to the compositor's using his brains, beneficently, as he may have thought. 'Painting' for 'panting' need not be due to bad handwriting: the identical error was made by the 1625 compositor of Browne's *Britannia's Pastorals* who was certainly setting up from the 1616 folio. The misprint 'sword' for 'foord' is almost as easily made from print as from MS. And so on.

This failure to make all allowances is a weakness in the book. Sometimes Dr Doran is too hasty, too soon satisfied. For instance, one cannot accept her conjecture that the reading of Q 1 at v, iii, 46-7 (in copies which have K 4^v uncorrected) may represent Shakespeare's original draft if aligned in this way:

Sir I thought it fit, to [send] the old
And miserable king to some retention.

Shakespeare could never have aligned his verse in this way. The line division must always have been that of Q 2:

To send the olde and miserable King.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

Thomas Heywood: Playwright and Miscellanist. By ARTHUR MELVILLE CLARK. Oxford: Blackwell. 1931. xii + 356 pp. 21s.

Dr Clark's detailed examination of Heywood's work and career, touching upon every publication that has been or is now attributed to Heywood, concludes with Lamb's celebrated dictum that in drama Heywood is a sort of prose Shakespeare. That is to say, Dr Clark does not make it his business to question the soundness of traditional literary judgments: his aim is first to give a surer and more ample foundation to our knowledge of Heywood's biography, and secondly to establish more accurately the canon of his works. The biographical section begins with a convincing attempt to identify Heywood's father with the Robert Heywood, rector of Rothwell and of Ashby-cum-Fenby in the deanery of Grimsby, who migrated from Cheshire in 1573. The dramatist was probably born after July 31 of that year (when his father was licensed to preach in the deanery of Grimsby) and before 1575. It is suggested that he entered Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1591, left owing to his father's death in 1593, then made for London and possibly became Southampton's 'servant' in an unknown company. All this is necessarily very vague, but nothing more is known of him until Henslowe's first uninformative mention in 1596. Dr Clark hazards the guess that this was 'a cautious trial order at the end of the off season.' At any rate 'hawodes bocke' cannot be satisfactorily linked with any particular play, although both 'that wilbe shalbe' and 'nabucadonizer' are tentatively preferred by Dr Clark,

the latter on the dubious grounds that it was evidently an old-fashioned Biblical play, the sort of thing that could be safely entrusted to a novice.

The contract with Henslowe to act for the Admiral's men for two years ends this period of speculation, and Dr Clark surveys skilfully Heywood's relations with the different companies, though when discussing Worcester's men he falls into the error of putting the Boar's Head in Eastcheap instead of outside the city limits. From September 1602 to March 1603 Heywood is concerned in nine plays mentioned in Henslowe's *Diary*, but it must be an exaggeration of even Heywood's tremendous fertility to describe this as 'supplying his company with a play or more a month,' for of these nine plays *Cutting Dick* received additions only, six were but in part by Heywood, and only two were written without the assistance of collaborators. Moreover, there is not much to be said for the conjecture that *Albere Galles* was probably a revival because the £6 which Heywood and Smith received for it was paid in a lump sum. The amount is sufficient to infer that the play was new.

Dr Clark has a new theory to advance concerning *Lady Jane*: that in the twenty scenes of *If you know not me, you know nobody*, part 1 (which is a good deal shorter than the average Elizabethan play) and in the three irrelevant scenes of part 2, Heywood's share of *Lady Jane* survives. There are certain objections to be answered before the suggestion may be accepted. In the first place it implies that Heywood wrote a large share of *Lady Jane*, in spite of the fact that there were four other collaborators, and the contributions of two of them are generally admitted to make up *Sir Thomas Wyat*. To add the twenty-three scenes of *If you know not me* to *Sir Thomas Wyat* would produce a piece of such inordinate length that the hypothetical second part (in which Dr Clark does not quite believe) would have to be called in to explain it away. Secondly, *Lady Jane* does not appear in *If you know not me*; indeed she is dead when it opens, so that Dr Clark actually supposes the play *Lady Jane* to have continued for at least twenty-three scenes after *Lady Jane's* death. Further, it is not entirely possible to follow Dr Clark when he writes that the death of Gresham was omitted from *If you know not me*, part 2, 'perhaps by the actors, but more probably by the printer,' and the 'independent and corrupt' scenes of the Armada and Parry's treason inserted in its place. If the printer was responsible he must still have had access to the copy of the first part to which Dr Clark says the corrupt scenes properly belong. Yet the 1605 edition of part 1 is notoriously a pirated stenographic text, perhaps improved here and there by the collusion of some actors in the play, and it is difficult to envisage circumstances in which these essential scenes from part 1 should be omitted by the printer in 1605, but nevertheless be squeezed into part 2 in the following year.

Dr Clark is extremely sound and illuminating when he turns to those plays of which he would add a part at least to the Heywood canon; among them he includes *Appius and Virginia*, *Dick of Devonshire*, *A Yorkshire Tragedy* and *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage*. Perhaps the most convincing section in his entire volume is to be found in those twenty odd pages in which the authorship of *A Yorkshire Tragedy* is

assigned to Heywood. Notwithstanding their excellence, it may safely be forecast that the chapters discussing the less familiar side of Heywood's activities will prove equally useful. Here the student will be grateful for Dr Clark's expert guidance; for into the productions of Heywood's later years, the miscellanies, and in general his writings after quitting the stage, only the utmost patience or piety will carry a reader. To have the popular biographies and Puritan pamphlets charted and accounted for is of value not merely in so far as it is necessary for a clear understanding of Heywood himself, but as a solid contribution to the study of seventeenth-century journalism. And for the reader who is not a specialist the single chapter of critical appreciation will provide much wise and discriminating comment.

I hope it will not be out of place here to protest against Dr Clark's practice of using the editorial 'we' when he puts forward a private judgment. It is often confusing, and generally ugly: as, 'we believe we have found him,' meaning that Dr Clark has hit upon a clue to Heywood's paternity, or again, when writing of the Revels Accounts, 'we discovered a piece of evidence, hitherto overlooked.' Did Dr Clark discover it, or someone else? The following misprints should be corrected: 'G. R. Harrison' should read 'G. B. Harrison' (p. 9); 'December 1922' should read 'December 1926' (p. 10); 'Gräz' should read 'Graz' (pp. 16 and 28); 'incline' should read 'inclines' (p. 103); 'delated' should read 'related' (p. 122); 'labout' should read 'labour' (p. 254); 'centemporary' should read 'contemporary' (p. 255); 'Oppius' should read 'Appius' (p. 273), and 'Sherburn' should read 'Shirburn' (p. 276). The quotations on pp. 66 and 166 are repeated on pp. 75 and 210 respectively, though in the latter instance with a minor inaccuracy.

W. P. BARRETT.

LONDON.

The Wits or Sport upon Sport. Edited by JOHN JAMES ELSON. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, London: H. Milford. 1932. xiii + 440 pp. 26s. 6d.

This book will dissipate some ugly misconceptions, the fruit of careless iteration. Thanks to Dr Elson's bibliographical labours, it is no longer permissible to scholars to refer indifferently to Kirkman's Drolls or Cox's Drolls, seeing how clearly he has demonstrated that Francis Kirkman was neither the sole compiler nor the first publisher of the collection of seventeenth-century playlets to which his name has long been unscientifically attached, and that Robert Cox the comedian has infinitely little claim upon the authorship of the drolls. Of the twenty-seven playlets which have been thus insensately ascribed, five were first printed in the editions of *Acteon and Diana* issued shortly before the Restoration, with attributions to Cox which, though not wholly untrue, could not have been fully justified. Cox still remains a somewhat shadowy personage, but it is unfortunate that the recently discovered fact that he was a member of Beeston's Cockpit company in 1639 should have eluded Dr Elson, since, not being able to trace his association with any reputable London organisation before the Wars, he has been compelled to characterise him

as no better than a stroller. He is surely wrong also in surmising that *Acteon and Diana* was first printed by sympathising friends of Cox's about the period of his death (which occurred on December 12, 1655), and that he probably never saw it. To my mind, the notification on the title-page, 'for the author,' intimates that the booklet was printed by Cox himself, with a view to its sale at the places where he performed. In the circumstances, it seems too sweeping to disallow Cox's authorship of the entire four playlets then issued, and I should be inclined personally to credit him with *Acteon and Diana*.

Dr Elson throws new light on the puzzling relationship between Marsh and Kirkman as publishers but has not fully succeeded in clearing up the mystery. *The Wits, Part I*, was issued by Henry Marsh in 1662, and reprinted later by Kirkman. Part I has a preface by Marsh, as compiler, stating that the drolls were designed for the amusement of the reader and for casual amateur performance. Kirkman, in part, reprinted this, but substituted his own name as compiler. In Part II, issued by Kirkman alone in 1673, Cox's name was for the first time associated with the drolls generally. He is spoken of as their contriver in the Commonwealth period, though with one and all he cannot, either as adapter or player, have been connected. We are told also of the popularity of himself and his drolls at the Red Bull. Into the trap thus laid some investigators (including myself) have foolishly fallen. As the famous frontispiece, over which there has been so much controversy, was first issued with Part I in 1662 and was neither elucidated nor inscribed, there is practically no warrant, as Dr Elson points out, to associate it with the Red Bull.

Of the thirty-eight playlets printed by Marsh and Kirkman at various times, twenty-four were taken from well-known Elizabethan plays, and all given in Part I had been acted. All in that part are ascribed to their originals, save *Simpleton the Smith* and *Bumpkin*, which, in my opinion, were substantive farces, and the work of Robert Cox. Part II is a much inferior compilation, almost a catchpenny, seeing that it consists to some extent of ineptitudes wholly lacking in humour or interest, and of no possible use to the stroller. Moreover, *Wiltshire Tom*, as here textually presented—from the original court masque, without adaptation—could never have been acted on the common stage.

What strikes one in ploughing one's way conscientiously through these drolls (they are often tedious reading) is, taking them in the mass, their shapelessness and tantalising brevity, many being without beginning or end. But they are not all of a type, and it is plain to be seen they were made to serve various ends. Kirkman's latest title-page informs us that they had been acted at fairs in town and country, by strollers and fiddlers in all sorts of places, and on mountebank stages by the mountebank's zanies. Drolls acted at fairs were necessarily short, being repeated at frequent intervals at a penny or twopence admission. Those intended for country performance, whether on open stage or in a hall, were so contrived as to require few properties, and only such (like stools and tables) as could be readily procured anywhere. Drolls like *The Sexton*, necessitating the use of beds or other unwieldy articles of furniture, were

designed solely for performance in a playhouse. The same reservation applies to drolls calling for elevated action. *Simpleton the Smith* must have been originally a theatre droll, since at one juncture an upper window was utilised by one of the characters, but it is noteworthy that in the version given in *The Wits* (p. 422) this 'business' is omitted, an indication that the droll had been given otherwise than in a theatre.

Caution, however, must be exercised in arriving at conclusions. On first thoughts, one would be inclined to say that drolls designed for a considerable number of players, anything over half-a-dozen, were intended solely for London performance, but this would be an erroneous assumption. I think we can account for the fact that some of the drolls ignore the old law of re-entry and bring on the same characters at the beginning of a scene who concluded the previous one, notwithstanding that there has been a lapse of time or a change of locality. My idea is that these gaucheries were largely due to the making of the drolls for acting on mountebank stages, and that there a peculiar system of performance obtained. It is vital to bear in mind that several of the foreign quacks who roamed all over England and Scotland in the mid-seventeenth century had a surprising number of buffoons in their pay. One of the best known of these (he remained for many years), John Puncteus, was licensed by Sir Henry Herbert in 1630, 'with ten in his company, to exercise the quality of playing for a year, and to sell his drugs.' Now, it would not have been politic for a mountebank to indulge the gaping crowd with a farce given all of a breath. They believed in the liming of 'to be continued in our next.' A scene or two of the droll would be given, leaving the spectators longing for more and content to listen to the harangues of the mountebank concerning his nostrums, in the hope of gaining further free amusement. With intermissions of this order, ugly ruptures of the Law of Re-entry would pass unnoticed, since they led to no confusion. Notable among the drolls in which they occur are *The Bouncing Knight* and *Jenkin*, but I should not go so far as to say that these were acted solely on mountebank stages.

There can be nothing but undiluted praise for the care and industry with which Dr Elson has edited the old drolls. Doubtless there will be some who will adjudge his meticulous labours on the texts of these trivialities in collating them with their originals—where they had any—equivalent to the breaking of a butterfly on a wheel. The results, however, are so interesting as to evoke a certain measure of scholarly gratitude. One is enabled to arrive at the conclusion that, apart from the two Elizabethan jigs, none of the thirty-eight drolls, *qua* drolls, could have been very old. Though Dr Elson has no suspicion of the fact—if fact it be—it would appear that many of them were extracted from recent prompt books rather than printed plays. The three Shakespearean drolls are of particular interest, and two of them sustain this impression. Collation shows that *The Grave Makers* was probably taken from *Hamlet*, Q. 5 (1639), a faint clue to the date of making. Prompt-book source is, however, indicated in *The Bouncing Knight*, in which the variants mostly conform to *Henry IV*, Part 1, Q. 8 (1639), though in two instances they

follow no known edition. A like inference is still more permissible in the case of *Bottom the Weaver*, since it agrees with no particular text of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, though presenting echoes of the Second Folio. It is much longer than the average droll, and infinitely better made. What is noteworthy is that it was published separately in 1661 by Marsh and Kirkman unitedly, as 'it hath been often publicly Acted by some of his Majesties Comedians, and lately, privately presented, by several Apprentices.' To my mind, Dr Elson fails to see the significance of this statement when he opines that the droll had been acted before the Civil War. There is little likelihood that the King's Men would have demeaned themselves to act in a droll made out of one of their famous plays while they were still recognised and honoured as the King's Servants. But, under the stress of the times, it is probable enough that they acted surreptitiously in playlets of the kind after the closing of the theatres. As an organisation they would then be disbanded, and it is remarkable that the droll is not said to have been acted by his 'Majesties Comedians,' but 'by some of his Majesties Comedians.'

Among others of the drolls which seem to me to have been prepared from recent prompt copies are, (1) *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*, which has one reading superior to quarto or folio; (2) *Forc'd Valour*, which agrees with no particular text of its original, *The Humorous Lieutenant*; (3) and *The Encounter*, which cannot be said to follow any text of *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, though mostly in accord with the quarto of 1635.

On one or two points, I take leave to break a friendly lance with Dr Elson. Though the term 'drollery' had somewhat loose application in the seventeenth century, it is untenable to argue that it may have been applied to puppet plays (p. 20) in order to justify the ascription of two scriptural playlets in the second part of *The Wits* to the puppet stage. Puppet plays were known distinctively as 'motions.' In substantiation of his surmise, Dr Elson cites (p. 21, n. 1) a reference in Dekker to 'a Dutch peece of Drollery,' miscomprehending the allusion which is to a Dutch genre painting. 'Piece' was often used then to mean 'picture': thus 'night-piece' meant a painting of moonlight.

Regarding the jg of *The Black Man*, Dr Elson takes the title to refer to a vendor of blacking, but I have my doubts whether there were any such, and believe that he was a hawker of black metal-ware. Otherwise, how came it that this particular man was selling tinder-boxes? A tinder-box man figured in one of the antimasques in Davenant's *Britannia Triumphans* in 1638. It seems to me also that Dr Elson misconstrues the term 'a continued farce' (p. 385), which, so far from implying a farce long in existence, simply means a farce in one act, played continuously.

Just a final word concerning that 'Monna Lisa' of illustrations, the mysterious frontispiece, which is here excellently reproduced. In discussing it, Dr Elson is certainly within his rights in traversing the contention that it reflects the characteristics of the Red Bull stage in the interregnum. All the same, some of the evidence advanced by him in substantiation of his attitude can be readily confuted. With the idea of

demonstrating that the Red Bull was from first to last an unroofed theatre, he draws attention to a statement in John Wright's song to the effect that the rope dancer known as the Turk, who performed occasionally in the old Clerkenwell house, executed his feats on a rope stretched 38 ft. above the ground; and he recalls to interested investigators the measurements of the first Fortune, in all probability as large a theatre as the Red Bull. But, according to these measurements, the first Fortune was 32 ft. high, which would mean, if the height can be taken to apply, that in the Red Bull the Turk's rope had no material support. When the Turk performed there, the rope must have been stretched from gallery to gallery at an elevation of no more than 30 ft. If then, 38 ft. was, as we are told, 'a greater height than a roofed-over playhouse would allow,' it was none the less a greater height than the largest unroofed playhouse would allow. The prime mistake is in supposing that the Turk always gave his performance in theatres. Apart from his various London appearances, he was often seen elsewhere, notably at Oxford during the Act.

Open confession being good for the soul, let me say that having oscillated between two opinions for over a quarter of a century concerning the evidential value of the frontispiece (as Dr Elson points out with—to me—somewhat painful particularity), I am now prepared to concede, on the strength of his able summing up, that it establishes nothing definitely and, without fear of loss, may be safely discarded from serious consideration. But I should be loth to go as far as Dr Elson and say that the artist drew upon his imagination for his details.

W. J. LAWRENCE.

LONDON.

Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795. By CHARLES HAROLD GRAY. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. vi + 333 pp. 20s.

The title of this book is somewhat misleading: Dr Gray is dealing only with periodical criticism, and is not attempting to include that which appeared in prologues and epilogues, prefaces and dedications, or in the numerous pamphlets that sprang up like fungi round every successful play. By the term 'theatrical criticism' he intends to draw a distinction between a criticism arising directly from the theatre, and one which is free to treat a play as a piece of literature without particular reference to its stage performance. The difference, he points out, is mainly one of the conditions under which the critic was working. By the terms of his definition, Dr Gray is at liberty to include in his survey not merely the criticism of particular plays, but such matters as stage presentation, acting, and even the quarrels and salaries of actors.

Within the limits he has thus set himself, he is able to bring together a good deal that even well-informed students of eighteenth-century drama are unlikely to know. He has on his side industry and a thorough knowledge of the matter he is dealing with; and though there are gaps in his enumeration of periodicals with relevant criticism (e.g., among the earlier periodicals, *The Post-Angel*, *The Tory Tatler*, *A Monthly Packet of*

Advices from Parnassus), those may be due not to the fact that he is unacquainted with them, but to the difficulty of including everything in a survey of moderate length. On the other hand, Dr Gray shows signs of hasty prospecting when he writes (p. 40) of *The Lover* that Steele gave no criticism or news of theatrical performances as he had promised in the fifth number to do. (See, for example, No. 27.) The faults of this book, however, arise not so much from omissions and inaccuracies, as from what its author has set out to do. One need not blame him for not making better use of the material he has accumulated: he is making a survey, and he is not bound to offer comments and explanations. But from the mass of material which he places before his reader, only a confused impression is obtained of an increasing amount of theatrical criticism as the century advances. The value of this book lies not in any new conclusions which Dr Gray is able to advance, but in the full references he gives to obscure periodicals that are likely to be outside the orbit of the student who is not a specialist in the period. It may seem ungracious to suggest it, but this book would have been of far greater value if it had appeared in the form of an annotated bibliography. It would then be easier to use, and, from its nature, it could be even more comprehensive.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

LONDON.

Milton's Private Correspondence and Academic Exercises. Translated by PHYLLIS B. TILLYARD. Introduction and Commentary by E. M. W. TILLYARD. Cambridge: University Press. 1932. xxxix + 143 pp. 10s. 6d.

This book answers a real need and will be of great service to students. The profusions, so important for what they tell us of Milton's life and interests at Cambridge, have never before been translated as a whole and therefore have not always been given the attention they merit; while the two previous translations of the letters are in many respects deficient. Here at last we have a complete translation of these documents that is both faithful and readable, together with an essay and notes bringing out their literary and biographical value more fully and clearly than ever before. Thus interpreted and made accessible to the general student, they should now receive wider attention and their material be incorporated in the ordinary everyday account of Milton's life and work; they should now become as well known as the more famous autobiographical passages in the prose tracts.

And yet one must complain that the editors seem to have been too intent on this work of popularisation, to the neglect of the more special needs of scholars. There being no convenient reprint of the original text, why did they not give Milton's Latin alongside their translation? Grateful as we are for an able and elegant translation, we like to have Milton's own words. With the Latin printed *en face* the volume could still have been handy in size, not too forbidding in appearance and, we hope, no higher in price; as it is, we must go on carting about our Toland or Birch. And

why no index? Surely half the value of a book so full of biographical and literary data should be there. What makes it all the more tantalising is that so little extra labour would have been entailed in converting this volume into the working edition wanted for the purposes of reference and of the research remaining to be done on these documents.

The first obvious reason for printing the Latin is suggested by Mr Tillyard's own remarks on the text. He states that the first edition of 1674 'is the sole authority for the text of very nearly all the letters and of all the exercises. Besides being badly punctuated it contains not a few misprints, the most important of which are specified in the textual notes... Subsequent editions have faithfully reproduced the original mistakes.' In the textual notes he tells us that 'no attempt has been made to indicate changes in the punctuation, since these are too numerous, the punctuation throughout being completely at random and frequently obscuring the sense.' In effect, then, we are given a translation of an unpublished text. Further, the statement that the 1674 volume is the sole authority for the text is qualified in a note pointing out that two of the letters survive in manuscript; one of these (No. 11) 'is preserved in the state archives at Oldenburg. The [partial] facsimile in Marsh and Sotheby shows some slight differences from the printed text. But even if the complete manuscript were available, I should not depart from the printed edition, which must have been issued under Milton's direction, unless compelled by obvious error.' Mr Tillyard's confidence that no such error would appear may in fact be justified; but, with regard to the principle involved, the authority of a manuscript reading cannot be disposed of in this happy-go-lucky manner, and, surely, in the case of a private letter would have to be accepted absolutely.

Another reason, also implied in Mr Tillyard's own observations, why Milton's text should have been given, is that no translation can render the style and tone of the original Latin. A Renaissance scholar writing in Latin was, even in familiar letters, inevitably self-conscious, imitative, formal, rhetorical; he was expressing himself within a special literary convention, and the matter as well as the form was in part dictated by his models. Such a letter is different *in kind* from one written on a similar occasion in English, and when translated, however skilfully, will often appear insufferably stilted, artificial and priggish. Mr Tillyard realises the danger and attempts to meet it in an admirable passage appreciating the literary skill, the charm and the humanity of these letters in their kind, and excusing what seems in the English a tendency to 'talk tall'; this vindication, however, of Milton's epistolary style is essentially an appeal to the Latin, and I doubt whether any reader who has not the Latin before him will be persuaded. Take, for instance, these words from the letter to Diodati of September 23, 1637: 'Quid agam vero? *πτεροφύω*, et volare meditor: sed tenillis admodum adhuc pennis evehit se noster Pegasus, humile sapiamus.' Here, to make Milton talk of 'growing wings and learning to fly' is to parody his words; any translation takes us into another and a wrong sphere of discourse.

When it comes to considering these documents for their biographical

and literary data, we still feel the need of the Latin text, as containing possible evidence or hints that are lost or obscured in translation. It may be important, for instance, in revealing the exact forms and the sources of ideas to be used later in the poetry. The two letters of September, 1637, to Diodati, which show Milton's state of mind and dominant thoughts at the time of writing *Lycidas*, are a case in point; or again, the passage in the seventh prolusion that derives from Plato's *Phaedo* and that connects up with similar passages in *Comus*. To deal with such matters we need Milton's *ipsissima verba*. However, apart from this grievance, perhaps insisted on overlong, we can only admire the way Mr Tillyard has brought out the information contained in these documents. Particularly interesting is the view he gives of Milton's personality—a view corroborated by evidence elsewhere. He shows that Milton, despite his serious-mindedness and sterner qualities, was not unsociable or deficient in urbanity, nor wanting altogether in that self-criticism we call a sense of humour; that he had the normal desire to charm and to be liked by his fellows; and that beneath his egotism and ambitious pride of nature lay a real and saving humility. In a word that he had grace of temperament, and was not the mere 'man of principle' we are often expected to believe in. This other more human side of Milton's nature is excellently illustrated by Mr Tillyard from the letters to his Italian friends:

The candid delight Milton shows in the Italians' good opinion of him and the generous affection it provoked in return are charmingly expressed. To those who imagine that Milton was a bigoted Protestant it will be surprising to hear him praising Catholics so ardently.... And in his letter from England to Dati he is almost pathetically anxious that his anti-Catholic principles should not alienate his Catholic friends. Freedom of speech he must have; but he values his friends to the utmost and cannot relinquish them

Mr Tillyard has already pointed out in his book on Milton that the prolusions supply general evidence, in support of Professor Hanford's detailed proof from the Commonplace Book, that Milton was from the first the ardent reformer and that the prose pamphlets cannot therefore be attributed solely to the political and domestic events that immediately occasioned them. But here he carries the argument further and represents the writing of the pamphlets as still less of a contingent affair:

It is usually thought that Milton's early ambition was to be a poet; that the prose works were undertaken entirely against his will, and that without the special occasions that evoked them they would not have been written. But this *Prolusion* suggests that Milton's ambitions were very comprehensive. He wished to sway men, to be a great teacher.... It seems to me quite clear that, in this *Seventh Prolusion*, Milton is thinking of ambitions that were realised in the prose works quite as much as of those that were realised in *Paradise Lost*.

It has long been recognised that the prolusions are valuable evidence for Milton's intellectual interests and pursuits at the University, particularly for his antipathy to the mediæval curriculum still prevalent there and his sympathy with the educational reformers; but a lot of necessary work remains to be done here. First we need a full and detailed account, in place of general and jejune accounts that mean little enough nowadays except to the mediævalist, of what the university curriculum

entailed. Until we have gone along with Milton in these studies we cannot get the most out of the prolusions or follow properly the subsequent development of his thought. For it is clear that Milton, while criticising the university curriculum, duly performed the work required; and it is clear to the casual reader that, like all the writers and scholars of his day, he derived much of his thought and learning from that mediæval literature he professed to despise. Milton's debt to his training in mediæval knowledge and method is a vast and fruitful field of research awaiting its competent scholar. Another cognate work, long overdue, is a *catalogue raisonné* of all the books he is known to have studied or read, arranged under languages, periods and literary categories, and giving the allusions in Milton's writings together with other evidence of the chronology and 'frequency' of the reading. It would be chiefly a question of collecting and ordering material now scattered through editions, biographies, monographs and articles; Mr Tillyard's notes indicate how rich, for instance, this present volume is in such material. When done, it will not only be one of the most valuable of Milton reference books, but will constitute a map of Milton's intellectual world and provide the basis for all studies of his ideas.

B. A. WRIGHT.

GLASGOW.

The Letters of Robert Burns. Edited from the original manuscripts by J. DE LANCEY FERGUSON. Two vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1931. 1 + 382 pp; vi + 413 pp. 30s.

The patient, exact and highly intelligent industry of Mr De Lancey Ferguson, of Western Reserve University, has removed one of the worst scandals of English—must one say British?—scholarship. With Burns, interest in the man has always notoriously and, it might be added, excessively, accompanied interest in the poet: and where will interest in the personality and the affairs of an artist more easily satisfy itself than in his letters? Yet it is only now that the Burns letters have been decently and completely edited. Let us be grateful, however, that the thing is done at last: as decently as the nicest standards could require, and as completely, it would seem, as human research can effect, after the wastage caused by lapse of time, carelessness of owners, and accidents of fire and flood. 'Robert Kerr...declares roundly, and twice over, that all the poet's unpublished letters to the printer were burnt'—'Hatley Waddell...relates that a fine collection formed by John Reid of Glasgow was ruined when flood waters of the Clyde invaded his house': so Mr Ferguson in his introduction, expressing 'profound scepticism...towards all such stories.' But that is characteristic of his caution. It is a pleasure to praise unreservedly the work of one whose claims are as modest as his scholarship is laborious and conscientious. 'The day is still far distant when it will be safe to assert that any edition of the Burns correspondence is complete and definitive. All that can be claimed for the present edition is that it brings that day a little nearer....' Something more than that may be said. A sudden eruption of new and unsuspected Burns letters is

not impossible; but it is more likely that our material henceforth will grow, if at all, by slow and minute accretions. Meanwhile, if we have not everything Burns wrote to his correspondents, in Mr Ferguson's edition we have nothing but that—so far, at least, as extant manuscript can ascertain it. The text of the main bulk of the letters has been finally and faithfully established. It will be long enough before anyone has to do over again what Mr Ferguson has done. It will take a very considerable eruption indeed, and a very improbable one, to put his work out of date.

What Burns, as a letter-writer, has had to suffer from the indecency of his editors, many have guessed at; few can have realised what a disgraceful story it has been, until they read Mr Ferguson's introduction, and confirm it by his text. And it is on the mangled and mauled versions of the letters that the common opinion of Burns as a letter-writer has been formed. What, then, will be the effect of Mr Ferguson's edition? In the first place, the biographical value of the letters is now incontestable. Nothing more should be heard of 'the inspired peasant.' Inspired or not, Burns was not a peasant. He was a farmer, and the plain fact is that he was much better educated than most of his readers were then, or are now. It is true that, as Robert Anderson declared, Burns himself fostered the legend; he was a shrewd man (poets often are), and he saw the value of it with possible subscribers. But the correspondence blows the legend to pieces. It should have done so before; but the piecemeal publication of the letters and the tampering of editors encouraged the general impression of a semi-literate's inexpressive striving after fine writing. But we can see now that the 'cultured English' in Burns's poems was not really an intrusion; it was simply that he was endeavouring to use '*the copia verborum*,' as Anderson called it, 'which the knowledge and use of the English and Scottish dialects afforded him'—knowing very well that colloquial language could never be enough for a poet of his ambition. Certainly his Scots is vastly better than his English, but that may be said of other educated Scotsmen—Sir Walter Scott, for instance.

Here, then, in the letters, we have Burns showing his 'knowledge and use' of English. And the next question is, how will he now stand as a writer of letters capable of being judged on their own merits? Much higher than he did, no doubt; but still not very high. It would have been better if the 'Letters to Clarinda' could have been lumped together in a single collection. Scattered as they are, according to chronology, among the rest of the letters, they give the reader a series of rather painful shocks. But the truth is, they belong to a quite different order of composition, and should be read, if read at all, as a continuous sequence. For the rest, however, it must be admitted that Burns was often capable of writing extraordinarily good English, much better than is commonly allowed. But it must be admitted also that he has not as a rule that power of subtly communicating himself which marks the supreme letter-writer. However, Mr Ferguson has done a first-rate piece of work, which no student of Burns can afford to ignore. His edition has added more than fifty new letters, and includes more than a hundred others which have not been accessible in any one standard edition hitherto. Above

all, the text he gives seems to be at last a text as authentic as scrupulous research can make it.

LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE.

LONDON.

Toward the Understanding of Shelley. By BENNETT WEAVER. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1932. xii + 258 pp. \$2.50.

The modest title of this book gives no clue to its importance. Here and there previous critics have glanced at Shelley's indebtedness to the Bible, but the extent and the profound significance of that obligation have never before been so fully worked out. Many Shelley scholars have allowed themselves to be blinded by the influence of the French Revolution and of Godwin on the poet, and one of Dr Weaver's aims is to see the play of these forces in a truer perspective. He is well qualified for the undertaking, as he possesses a sound knowledge, not only of Shelley, but also of the period in which he lived. As the book shows, there was a parallel between the abuses which pained the sensitive mind of Shelley and the wrongs which the Hebrew prophets denounced, and there can be no doubt but that Shelley was greatly moved by the teaching of Christ, especially in the Sermon on the Mount.

Far too often a study of this kind is exposed to two dangers: it tends to exaggerate and it becomes too mechanical. On the whole Dr Weaver steers clear of the first, and his method is too subtle for him to be wrecked on the second. He understands the working of the poetic mind and, in particular, he can trace the way in which that of Shelley functions. The result is that the task of assessing Shelley's debt to the Bible is everywhere performed with intelligence. The last chapter, especially, in which Dr Weaver shows how the Biblical material was blended and transmuted into poetry, is a skilful piece of interpretation. In some details we may disagree with Dr Weaver, and certainly in places he seems to underestimate the influence of Godwin, but this book appears to us an interesting, valuable and scholarly contribution to the better understanding of Shelley.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

Religious Creeds and Philosophies as represented by Characters in Sir Walter Scott's Works and Biography. By K. BOS. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris. 1932. xii + 291 pp. 4 fl. 50.

Dr Bos divides his book into two parts, the first of which deals with the various branches of the Christian religion, and the second with 'Pre-Christian and Non-Christian Religions,' under which heading chapters on fatalism, atheism, and the gipsies are included. The first part is subdivided from a chronological point of view. The Roman Catholic Church before and after the Reformation is discussed at length, and a whole chapter is devoted to Scott's views on Roman Catholicism. The Reformation in England and the Puritan sects, as well as the Quakers,

Methodists and Irvingites, are likewise considered, while the churches in Scotland, including the Cameronians, Independents and Buchanites, receive a similar exhaustive examination. The first part ends with a chapter on the Protestants on the Continent.

Dr Bos points out that in Scott's opinion religion should be combined with common sense. This explains his occasional failure to appreciate those martyrs who died for their faith. In religious matters he himself maintained a notable reserve, but his works show that he believed any religion to be better than none. Nor did he regard goodness as the monopoly of any particular creed. It would seem, however, that in his novels Scott was inclined 'to belittle Protestantism to the advantage of Roman Catholicism, not so much by reference to tenets as to individuals.' Hence George Borrow's attacks upon him.

This is a dispassionate and conscientious book and the reader is impressed by the range of Dr Bos's knowledge and his familiarity with those Scottish sects which, as a rule, can be but little known to the foreign scholar.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

Swinburne: a Literary Biography. By GEORGES LAFOURCADE. London: G. Bell and Sons. 1932. 330 pp. 15s.

Swinburne's poems were an offence to the Victorians; and when his life came to be written, with all possible sympathy, by an urbane but not emancipated Victorian, the book was bound to be a pattern of tact and reticence. It was a charming work, this memoir by Sir Edmund Gosse, and its discretion so perfect that the enormous reservations easily pass unnoticed. But it could not be accepted as final; the gaps had to be filled in and the corrections made. Probably Gosse was unaware of many of the facts first set forth in Dr Lafourcade's elaborate history of the more important half of the poet's life, *La Jeunesse de Swinburne*, which was reviewed in these pages when it appeared four years ago (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxiv). If he had known, he would probably have declined to write the book unless he remained at liberty to suppress what he preferred to ignore. Hence nothing could be more salutary than that the leadership in Swinburnian studies should have fallen to a Frenchman, whose prejudices if he have any are likely to run counter to Victorianism, and who is without any unwholesome dread of outspokenness. We may easily disagree with some of Dr Lafourcade's critical awards, but we must be grateful for an honest and well-attested re-statement of the life. Gosse is by no means superseded, but he must now be supplemented and collated with Lafourcade.

In comparison with the previous two weighty volumes, the present work has had to be reticent, the scale being much reduced, and there being no need for a full display of the evidence on which revelations and rectifications were based. In endeavouring to provide a standard biography for English readers, Dr Lafourcade has even felt obliged sometimes to keep a tight rein on his native candour and vivacity; as may be seen in

a comparison of his account here of the Menken episode with a recent article of his, *Swinburne et Adah Menken*, in the May number of *Marsyas*. But, in general, he expatiates just where Gosse was most guarded. The two long middle chapters, dealing with the period that brought forth the original series of *Poems and Ballads* and with the following period of *A Song of Italy* and *Songs before Sunrise*, are a capital instance. These are of absorbing interest, and should be compared in detail with Gosse, if only to bring out how admirably the two books are complementary one to the other. Dr Lafourcade omits much that was related by Gosse and which was interesting to read, no doubt feeling that the earlier book would always be available; what he tells is largely new, new at any rate when he wrote *La Jeunesse de Swinburne*, and has crucial importance in explaining how the poems came to be written.

Apart from numerous corrections of Gosse in matters of fact, and sufficient information about Swinburne's sadistic tendencies, on which of course the previous biographer was silent, to indicate what lay behind such poems as *Dolores*, *Félice*, or *Anactoria*, Dr Lafourcade puts a very different construction on the rôles played in the drama of the poet's life by Monckton Milnes, Richard Burton, and many others. Simeon Solomon is barely mentioned by Gosse; here it is made clear that he was a mischievous influence during most of the wild years when Swinburne was an anxiety to his friends. The extraordinary Charles Augustus Howell likewise appears as a much more sinister figure than would have been suspected from Gosse's mitigated and indeed perfunctory indictment. On the other hand, Dr Lafourcade brings out more forcibly or makes more intelligible the powerful influence exerted on Swinburne and on Swinburne's poetry by Rossetti, Morris, Mazzini, and later on Watts-Dunton. Solomon, Howell, and others like them, contributed to upset his private affairs; Milnes and Burton, Jowett and Nichol, were by no means neutral influences, but whatever effect his intimacy with them had upon his writing was indirect and mostly of small account. But Mazzini is shown to have had as powerful a sway over the poet's mind as that assignable to Victor Hugo, and a restraining and much healthier sway. To it we owe the serenity and austere beauty of *Hertha* and other fine poems in *Songs before Sunrise*. Swinburne, in spite of his well-known obstinacy, was always liable to be dominated by stronger personalities. He was an artist more than a man, his whole life and soul absorbed in the expression of emotion. There was more emotion than feeling, more excitement than depth. 'Dramatic, many-faced, multifarious,' he described the contents of *Poems and Ballads*, in which he made himself the mouthpiece of many moods and passions, not all originally and authentically his own. As he was thus not a self-contained, self-assertive personality, the motive, the inspiration, the creative urge, continually had its source in another mind; and when that mind was no longer there to inspire and support, when, for example, Mazzini died, the poet was left in a state of mental confusion, 'puzzled and disconcerted for want of any practical goal to which he might direct his inspiration.'

This susceptibility, this need to rely upon someone, is the real explana-

tion of his later history, the long Watts-Dunton episode. That was inevitable, if Swinburne the man, or Swinburne the poet, was to survive middle age. Gosse's reproaches were unjust; he seems to have had a personal grudge against Watts-Dunton, whom he depicted as guarding a bored prisoner and repressing his creative powers. Dr Lafourcade does not believe that the supposed gaoler destroyed the poet's inspiration; on the contrary, he says, 'had Swinburne never gone to the Pines, we should in all probability have lost *Tristram*, *The Heptalogia*, *Balen*, *Mary Stuart*, several exquisite poems and some remarkable pages of prose.' Having visited the two men of letters many times during this final period, I would go farther, and insist that nothing could conceivably have been better for Swinburne, and that his latter years were happy and as productive as could reasonably have been hoped.

Dr Lafourcade's is a 'literary biography,' and it contains much good criticism. Perhaps none of it is truer than the criticism of Swinburne by his own mother, quoted with approval here: 'He spoils his writings by not knowing where to stop.' It is difficult, however, to assent to Dr Lafourcade's insistence on 'the modern side' in Swinburne's nature and in his poetry. Modern in what way? In the fearless candour of his sentiments, apparently, and in his not shrinking from any theme, especially of an erotic character, that might be reprobated by the Victorians. But, surely, Shelley, Keats, Byron, not to go farther back, were as frank and fearless as Swinburne; and Browning, whose ideal poet was

One
Who chronicled the stages of all life,

did not shrink from truth-telling, though his antinomianism was of a different cast from Swinburne's. His frankness not being mainly about sexual aberrations, and his temperamental theism—of which I have heard Swinburne and Watts-Dunton express their opinion—being of that easy-going, optimistic brand that satisfied the Victorians, nobody was shocked. Is it not safer to remember that Swinburne was of the same period, and was subject to the same influences—influences to which he would be peculiarly susceptible—as FitzGerald, Lord de Tabley, James Thomson, Henley, Davidson, Marston, Hardy, and other poets of revolt? Kinship to 'Proust or Lawrence' seems very far to seek.

ERNEST A. BAKER.

LONDON

The Early Life and Adventures of Jean Jacques Rousseau. By ARTHUR LYTTON SELLS. Cambridge: W. Heffer. 1929. xxi + 148 pp. 8s. 6d.
Jean Jacques Rousseau and his Philosophy. By HARALD HÖFFDING. Translated by L. E. A. SAIDLA and WILLIAM RICHARDS. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1930. xxiv + 165 pp. 9s.

The publication since 1924 of some sixteen volumes of the *Correspondance générale*, prepared by Th. Dufour and published by P. P. Plan, has provided much material for a revaluation of J. J. Rousseau and of

his theories. In addition, a good deal of research has been done in recent years on particular aspects of Rousseau's life, his psychology and his art. These new data have been utilised in a number of biographies—some of them *romancées*—which have appeared in the United States of America or in this country during the last five or six years. Professor Sells' book is not a *biographie romancée*. It is a scholarly, but by no means pedantic, account of Rousseau's early life. The author has profited by the special studies and by the new material in the *Correspondance*, and has given us a pleasantly written and eminently readable biography. He has delineated Rousseau's portrait with sympathy and delicacy, not ignoring the morbid elements in the character (which others have sometimes unduly stressed), but taking a balanced view and doing justice to the growth of Rousseau's personality through the formative years. Professor Sells has made several pilgrimages to the scenes associated with Rousseau's early life and he has illustrated his book with excellent photographs. He has provided the English reader with an accurate, up-to-date and attractive introduction to the study of Rousseau's life and work. It is to be hoped that he will continue the task he has undertaken and produce a second volume dealing with the years of maturity and literary activity.

Professor Höffding's book, in the original Danish, appeared some thirty-six years ago, and, although there have since been German and French translations, it is now made available in English for the first time, corrected and modified in the light of recent research. There is an introduction by one of the translators, and a short preface by the author written for the American edition. The first hundred pages deal in turn with Rousseau's awakening and his problem, the *Confessions*, the life, character and works. The final chapter on Rousseau's philosophy examines in succession the fundamental ideas and the character of his thought, the religious problem, the political and social problem, and the pedagogical problem. The book is furnished with an index.

The interest of the work lies in the author's attempt to interpret Rousseau's life and doctrine as a unity, for Professor Höffding, like M. Lanson, discerns, behind the mass of superficial contradictions which have provided so much material for controversy, a central core of doctrine. He explains the paradoxical form of Rousseau's theories as due to temperament and to the identification of the civilisation of Rousseau's own day with civilisation in general. The essence of the problem lies, in Professor Höffding's view, in what Rousseau means by nature. When Rousseau contrasted nature and civilisation, 'he understood by nature spontaneity, simplicity, freedom and goodness. His charge against civilisation was that it made life circumspect, complex, strained and bad' (p. 3). Later Professor Höffding remarks that, whenever the work of civilisation was done by direct contact (i.e., by inspired geniuses), Rousseau had nothing but admiration for it; but what he found lacking in the civilisation of his epoch was originality, vigour and the freshness of nature (p. 6). In the course of the book Rousseau is shown as moving towards a clearer consciousness that civilisation is valuable and healthy if it increases in due proportion to the real needs of man's independence and individual

activity. Thus, Rousseau's protest against civilisation contained the germ of a new civilisation (p. 10). Professor Höfding expounds his view with clarity and skill. His analyses are marked by sympathy and insight. He presents Rousseau's life and work as a coherent and intelligible whole, and makes by the way many illuminating and suggestive remarks on Rousseau's psychology and on psychology in general. His book in its English dress is a welcome addition to the already long list of serious studies on the philosopher of Geneva.

FREDERICK C. ROE.

ABERDEEN.

Studies in Balzac's Realism. By E. PRESTON DARGAN, W. L. CRAIN and others. (*University of Chicago Studies in Balzac*, III) Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press; Cambridge: University Press. 1932. xi + 213 pp. 16s. 6d.

This volume, the third of a series of studies by 'a group of Chicago Balzicians,' is a collection of essays by students working under the guidance of Professor Dargan, who contributes a general introduction on Balzac's method. 'Method' is indeed the dominant characteristic of the book, but it is not altogether a quality.

The introductory chapter summarises and tabulates with admirable clearness the various processes of accumulation, repetition and arrangement of facts, details or words by which Balzac puts into his greater novels that peculiarly solid, material quality which makes his monsters so real and his fantasies so plausible. All this is analysed with mathematical precision, but the method is so scientific and the analysis so exhaustive that it is difficult to believe that the robust and irregular genius who created *La Comédie Humaine* could ever have produced his descriptions by following such a perfectly planned set of rules.

In reading this book one is confronted with the familiar difference between the scientific and the aesthetic conceptions of criticism. Is literary composition a science or an art? Those who believe that a novel or a poem can be produced by technical skill and formulae alone will find these studies excellently done and a great help towards a keener appreciation of Balzac's 'science,' but those who tend to hold the aesthetic point of view will leave this book more sceptical than they were before. Taken separately, the chapters, each by a different author who deals with one of the novels such as *Les Chouans*, *Le Curé de Tours*, *Le Père Goriot* or *Le Cousin Pons*, are interesting and suggestive. The book as a whole, however, shows too little variety; the essays testify to the efficiency of the writers' instructors, but the method of treatment, by its regularity, becomes monotonous. Each illustrates certain processes of Balzac's composition, such as his successive 'taps,' as they are here called, by quoting numerically the frequency of this or that, until the book seems to be a collection of statistics or a census of certain oft-repeated phenomena.

One chapter, that on *La Peau de Chagrin* by H. H. Millott, is worthy of special praise. Its author shows admirably by what 'method in madness,'

by what skilful touches of material detail, allusions to contemporary events and well-known places Balzac succeeds in giving plausibility to what is after all the most extravagant of fairy-tales. The true function of criticism should surely be to help the reader to understand and love the masterpiece, and this is the service which, by his skilful analysis, Mr Millott renders in respect of *La Peau de Chagrin*, Balzac's magnificent but somewhat vertiginous flight into the supernatural.

Each chapter has appended to it an excellent specialised bibliography, and the volume, which is illustrated, is a useful and readable contribution to a vast subject.

L. W. TANCOCK.

LONDON.

MARC BLANCHARD. *La Campagne et ses habitants dans l'œuvre de Honoré de Balzac. Témoignages et jugements sur Balzac*. Paris: H. Champion. 1931. 474 pp. and 336 pp. 75 fr., 40 fr.

The first of the two books by M. Blanchard is a highly specialised thesis of limited scope and interest. It examines without final criticism all that Balzac has written about the peasant, agriculture and the question of property and land ownership in France during and since the Revolution. This really implies an exhaustive discussion of the three rustic novels of *La Comédie Humaine: Le Médecin de Campagne, Le Curé de Village* and *Les Paysans*, of the politics and political economy of which Balzac was so proud. The general conclusion of M. Blanchard, and therefore, according to him, the reason why these novels are relatively unreadable to-day, is that Balzac's personal knowledge of the land was slight and for the most part second-hand, and his opinions based on *a priori* theories. Only those parts of the *Scènes de la Vie de Campagne* are interesting in which Balzac discusses human types common to town and country alike.

The second, on the contrary, is a book of far more general interest. None but a full-time specialist with years before him can hope to read all that has been written about Balzac. Of the immense quantity of books of criticism devoted to *La Comédie Humaine* and its author, so many stress unduly one view or the other, whether unreserved praise or unrelieved censure, so many have been written by the prejudiced in support of a predetermined thesis, that the unwary student of Balzac who turns for guidance to the 'authorities' is in danger at least of losing his sense of proportion, if not of getting a wholly distorted impression.

This anthology of the critics of Balzac, though not intended for the specialist, is yet sufficiently detailed to be of great value to every student, while it is full of interesting information for any reader of the novels. M. Blanchard has taken extracts from hundreds of documents ranging from opinions of contemporaries, friends and relations of Balzac down to those of modern critics, and he has arranged this material in ten chapters which proceed logically from the first two on Balzac's origins, family, person and character, by way of his culture, taste, realism, mysticism, to

the final chapters on the moral purport of his work and his qualities and defects as a writer.

Each chapter has many subdivisions and within each of these the quotations are arranged more or less chronologically, so that it is possible in a moment to find in juxtaposition the opinions, often entirely contradictory, of all the critics or authorities upon almost any conceivable aspect of Balzac and his work. In the minimum of time, therefore, it is possible to weigh evidence of all kinds and tendencies on a given point, and to reach a conclusion which has taken into account all sides of the question.

Two examples will suffice to illustrate the width of range and divergence of the quotations. One section of the chapter on *La Comédie Humaine* quotes the judgments of many critics under the headings: title, proportion, classification, digressions, reappearance of characters, inequality, omissions and repetitions from earlier volumes, while a division of the chapter on Balzac as a thinker gives varied opinions on Balzac as a royalist, a social prophet, a man of firm convictions, a moderate monarchist, a man without convictions, a democrat, a socialist and a revolutionary.

The book is a triumph of editing, not only invaluable as a source of information but fascinating as an entertainment. It has a very full index and classified bibliographies.

L. W. TANCOCK.

LONDON.

Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz. Von K. JABERG und J. JUD. Bd. III (Mineralien—Bodengestaltung und Gewässer—Tiere—Jagd und Fischerei—Waldbau und Holzhauergeräte—Pflanzen). Zofingen (Schweiz): Ringier. 1930. 240 maps. 220 Sw. frs. 55.

The contents of this volume, upon which we make these rather belated observations, are distributed as follows: Names of minerals, maps 413-19; landscape features, 420-32; mammals, reptiles, insects and birds, 433-517; hunting and fishing, 518-29; forestry and wood-cutting, 530-57; trees, shrubs and plants, 558-642. In a very frank and interesting opening statement the authors set forth the exceptional difficulties which confronted them in the making of this volume. Not only had they to become in turn zoologists, botanists, entomologists and what not, but they were continually faced with the baffling instability, lack of precision, and frequent interchangeability of popular nomenclature in relation to living things, animal or vegetable. Frequently, too, there was a lack of positive knowledge on the part of the informants, who were chosen, not as specialists in this or that domain of rural knowledge, but as typical specimens of the average dialect speaker in the several regions explored. It is therefore little to be wondered at that, of the mass of rural lore which is here collected, some was felt by the authors to be of too divergent and insecure a type to be presented cartographically. Much of it is therefore relegated to the margins of the various maps, and in a great number of cases, where it is presented in map form, the reader is warned to give

particular care to the observations, doubts and reservations which accompany it.

Dealing as it does with the features and objects of the country-side, this volume was sure to have a peculiar interest in the rich store of archaic words which it was bound to contain, Latin or Celtic, pre-Latin or pre-Celtic, especially in the Alpine areas, where, by the way, the nomenclature, particularly with regard to flora, is shown to be remarkably varied. One is therefore not surprised to see the survivals, rare or numerous, of Celtic *grav-* in the 'ghiaia' and 'ganda' (maps 487, 427 *a*), of *cumba* in 'la valle' (428), *rusca* 'bark' in 'la scorza' (563), *verna* 'alder' in 'Pontano' (583), *bruk* 'heather' in 'la scopa' (617), and one expected and receives new light upon the distribution of such probably pre-Roman relicts as *balma* (424), *bles* (425), *ganda* (427 *a*), *crap* (423), *tana* (424) and the like, which are typical elements of the vocabulary relating to mountain landscape. Of Latin rarities and survivals there are several which show up immediately: the Lombard **maustris*, i.e., the 'May-berry' in the 'fragola' map (610), the Rhetian *fastigium* 'slope for rolling down lumber,' and its verb *fastigiare*, in map 535, none of which has been registered by Meyer-Lübke; the mysterious though familiar-looking *gumpare* for *saltare* (430), which is found from Rhetia to Sardinia and which, like *tana*, if not Latin in origin, must have been widely current in Latin times; the vestiges of, from the Romance point of view, older words and uses such as *aequa* in 'la valle' (428, Sardinia), *sames* in 'la palude' (432, Piemonte), widespread forms of *orso* with a *t*, cp. Gr. ἄρκτος (433), *meles* derivatives for the Germanic *tasso*, which ceases south of Naples (436), *testudo* for *tartaruga* in Sardinia and South Italy (450, margin), *anguis* in Liguria on the 'lizard' and 'green-lizard' maps (449, 450), *fragrare* for *fiutare* (520) in Sardinia and Rhetia, remnants of *graculus*, -a, in the 'corvo' and 'cornacchia' maps (501, 502), *secare* with its old meaning 'to cut' in map 532, not only in Sardinia, but at points 338 and 716, an interesting survival of *scamnium* in map 557, 'la pietica,' in Campania, the Basilicate and Apulia, and lastly the valuable *ire* information which is displayed on maps 532 and 636.

But more striking, perhaps, because of the light which it throws upon the formation of the vocabulary of spoken Latin, is the conspicuous evidence which this volume produces upon the infiltration of Greek words. To bring this point home I have compiled the following list, which does not claim to be complete, of words which occur in this volume, some of them, it is true, only in the Magna Græcia area or its vicinity, but others much more widespread and many even 'gemeinromanisch': μάλθα 'la calcina' (415); κρύπτη 'una roccia,' 'la caverna' (423, 424); σκόπελος 'una roccia,' 'la parete' (423, 423 *a*); σπήλαιον and σπήλυνξ (423, 424); κόγχη 'la valle' and 'l'avvallamento' (428, 428 *a*); σκίουρος 'lo scoiattolo' (442); ένυδρίς (?) 'la lontra' (440); χελώνη 'tartaruga,' confined to S. (450, margin); βάτραχος 'la rana,' confined to S. (453); κοχλίας 'la chiocciola' and 'il guscio' (459, 460); λείμαξ 'la lumaca' (461); ίππος 'la cavalletta' (466); ricinus, Greek, according to Pliny, for 'zecca' (475, margin); όσμή 'scent,' widespread from Rhetia to Southern Italy in

'fiutare' (520); *κάμπη*, not only in Sicily and the south, but also, in the widespread derivative *kamula*, over great areas in the north, 'il bruco,' 'la tignola' (481, 482); *βροῦχος* (?) and *βόμβαξ* (?) (481); *τέρετρον* (?) (482); *κάμπαρος* 'il gambero' (483); *ἀράχνη* 'il ragno' (485); *χελιδών* (?), in the Venetian types *selza*, *beliga* 'la rondine' (499); *πέρδιξ* 'la pernice' (510); *τρόφη*, in Sicily and south, 'i cespugli' (531); *σχίζα*, *σχίδιον* 'la scheggia' (539); *στρόφιον* 'fagot-band,' 'la ritorta' (546); *κῦμα*, traces in south, 'il ramo' (559); *κόμμι* 'la resina' (568); *ράξ*, *ράγος* 'il rovo' (608); *κισσός*, at a few points in the south, 'l'edera' (619).

Such an abundance of Greek words in the nomenclature of the countryside is a little astonishing, though one can attempt an explanation of the existence of some of them. The urban vocabulary of Rome would in many cases not possess a word of its own to impose on the provincial areas, with their picturesque variety of local names, for essentially rural things. The choice would frequently lie between a dialect word with the taint of 'rusticitas' and a Greek word with no such blemish; the kind of consideration which, in the embarrassment of wealth of provincial forms, favours the adoption by literary Italian of an entirely non-popular *libellula* for the 'dragon-fly' or *coccinella* for the 'lady-bird.' It is no accident, as we shall see, that in present-day Italy those city-dwellers and faithful companions of man, 'la cimice,' 'la pulce,' 'il pedocchio,' and 'la mosca' (maps 473, 474, 475, 477), show a completely uniform distribution, whereas the insects of the countryside give us maps of most varied linguistic hue.

Extreme lexicographical variety would therefore appear to be the characteristic feature of this third volume of the *AIS*, a variety due to a number of causes. There is, first of all, the all-important consideration alluded to above, that upon the type of word collected in this volume the urban standard speech, whether Latin or Italian, exercises, or has exercised, the least possible controlling influence, whether because the thing itself is confined to a definite provincial area, e.g., 'il rododendro' (581) and the Alpine vocabulary generally, or separated from central interference by an intervening zone where the object does not occur, e.g., 'il sorbo' (587), 'la pina' (574), or, again, is so definitely rural as to escape the influence of a not too well-established standard equivalent, e.g., 'l'orbettino' (451), 'la grillotalpa' (467), 'mudare' (517), 'fiutare' (520). The forces which make for variety have thus free and full play. The creative stimulus towards verbal invention exercised by certain living creatures, whose habits are picturesque or grotesque, baleful or beneficent, is unchecked, and the way is open for all sorts of folk-lore influences and sound symbolism to make themselves manifest in the provincial vocabulary. Small wonder, then, that the maps of 'the bat' (448), 'the fire-fly' (469), 'the lady-bird' (470), 'the dragon-fly' (479), 'the butterfly' (480), 'the snail' (459), 'the dung-beetle' (472), and in another domain, the 'grattaculo' (606), present a most variegated picture, where the problems of word distribution are to be solved on what have hitherto been rather unfamiliar lines. Another factor contributing to this somewhat baffling variety is the common confusion of

kindred species of bird, beast, or plant, in popular nomenclature, which the authors mention in their foreword. This is particularly evident, for example, in maps like 'il ghiro,' 'il topo,' 'il ratto' (443, 444, 446), 'il corvo' and 'la cornacchia' (501, 502), 'la ghandaià' and 'la gazza' (503, 504), 'il gufo' (508), 'il salcio' and 'la vetrice' (600, 601). A third is the uncertainty and lack of clear definition of the concept underlying such rubrics as 'l'argilla' (416), 'la melma' (419), 'il ciocco' (538), 'la scheggia' (539). A fourth may be the inadequacy, phonetic or otherwise, the disappearance or non-existence of an ancient form, e.g., *rvvus*, *alba spina*, *aquilentum*, in 'un ruscello' (431), 'il biancospino' (604), 'la rosa selvatica' (605).

Though everywhere a happy hunting-ground for the lexicographer, the volume, therefore, on first acquaintance, seems rather a wilderness to the linguistic geographer proper. Instead of the subtle interplay of historical, social, psychological and phonological factors which condition the distribution of words in most of the maps of the preceding volumes, here it is the harsh geographical fact which appears to predominate. Not only is the presence or absence of a word determined by the presence or absence of the specified thing, plant or animal, in a given area—hence the great number of half-maps, confined either to north or south, which this volume contains—but also a rubric which has evoked a reply in the whole of the charted area may have quite different connotations according to the different geographical conditions prevailing in the various zones: clearly the conception of 'a hill' will be quite different with the plain-dweller in the Po basin and the Rhetian mountaineer (cp. map 422, 'il monticello'), and similarly, the idea of 'clay' or 'mud' will vary considerably in the parched lands of Sicily and the rice fields of Lombardy (maps 416, 'l'argilla' and 419, 'la melma'). So that one is frequently confronted with, and a little dismayed by, what looks like a confused and incoherent medley, a tangled pattern most difficult to unravel because little or nothing of the familiar word stratification can at first sight be detected.

A closer acquaintance, however, reveals a great wealth of material for other than merely lexicographical purposes. I have already hinted at the folk-lore interest of a number of the maps, and the various influences determining popular nomenclature, imitative, imaginative, or legendary, which they reveal. Particularly valuable under this head, in addition to those mentioned above, are 'la raganella' (454), 'la zanzara' (477 margin), 'la ballerina' (498), 'il sugo dell' albero' (567), 'la resina' (568), 'l'acetosa' and 'l'acetosella' (627, 628), 'il dente di leone' (630).

Material for phonological study is abundant everywhere, though one may single out as of special interest for various reasons: 'il lupo' (434), 'la volpe' (435), 'la lontra' (440), 'il ghiro' (443), 'la cimice' (473), 'il nido' (515), 'è andato' (532), 'l'amo' (524), 'la radice' (558), 'il ramo' (559), 'il midollo' (566), 'il faggio' (578), 'il pioppo' (585), 'la rovere' (591), 'la ghianda' (593), 'l'alloro' (598), 'la felce' (618), 'l'edera' (619).

The capital problem of the Tuscan and non-Tuscan elements in standard Italian is again raised very acutely in this volume, not only by the maps

'il topo,' 'la rana,' and 'il midollo' studied by Mr Jud in the *Gauchat Festschrift*, but also by such maps as 'la sabbia,' 'l'orbettino,' 'lo scarafaggio,' 'lo stornello,' and 'un' asse.' 'La sabbia' (418) shows Tuscany to be clearly a *rena* area, which has given its gender to a *sabulum* form come in from the north. 'L'orbettino' or 'la cecilia' (451), an interesting map with its representatives of *cæcus*, *orbis*, **aboculus*, *luscus* and Fr. *borgne*, shows the *orbis* derivatives to be clearly northern. Tuscany offers no trace of them, but is mainly a *luscus* or rather *luscinius*¹ area. 'Lo scarafaggio' (472), on the other hand, is southern and Sicilian, in Tuscany, derivatives from *merda* and other words prevail. With 'lo stornello' (500) and 'un' asse' (556) we revert to the north, the Tuscan forms being respectively 'lo storno' and 'una tavola,' and Sicilian *stornello* forms being almost certainly French. All these cases, and others, including those where the literary 'Stichwort' chosen by the authors has little or no provincial backing, like 'la coccinella,' 'la libellula,' 'fiutare,' 'mudare' and even 'la chiocciola' and 'l'usignuolo,' deserve full investigation to help on a satisfactory solution of an important and fascinating problem.

At an earlier date I alluded to the importance of the *AIS* for the study of French influence, past and present, in the vocabulary of the peninsula. It would not be surprising if, in words closely or remotely connected with falconry or the chase, a good deal of French influence were discernible in this collection. One would mention as of immediate interest under this head the widespread forms reminiscent of French *foune* on the 'fama' map (437), and of *belette* in 'la donnola' (438), both in the extreme north-east and in Sicily and the south; further, among the bird maps, Fr. *pinson*, occurring in Sicily, Calabria and Apulia in 'il fringuello' (489), *mauvis* forms for 'tordo' (494) in the same area, and traces of *fauvette* also in the extreme south in 'il beccafo' (495 a). That the diminutivised *stornello* from the north of the Po is also French is confirmed by the 'civetta' map (507), which would seem clearly to prove, despite Meyer-Lübke's opinion, that *civetta* is a Tuscanised adaptation of Fr. *chouette*; witness the Umbrian form *cuetta*, and Venetian *šuetà*. Given the fact that the word scarcely reaches as far as Naples, it is safe to look upon it as an immigrant from France, though it has taken root more widely and deeply than the diminutive *stornello* (Fr. *étourneau*) for *storno*.

The maps for the 'jay' and the 'magpie' (503, 504) raise a number of perplexing and attractive problems, among them that of the relationship between Fr. *agace* and *geai*, on the one hand, and Italian *gazza* and its provincial equivalents, *gaya* and the like, on the other. One of the great merits of a linguistic atlas is to destroy the entirely fictitious value of an accepted literary form and to put it on the same plane with its less favoured dialect rivals. The *gaya* forms and their local variants, *gaggia*, etc., here acquire full status and become as integral a part of the whole problem as the standard *gazza*. A complete solution must take all forms into account and cannot, I hasten to say, be discerned forthwith. It will be found more readily, I believe, if we are not blinded by the absurd

¹ It is difficult to dissociate Sardinian *lissinu di erba*, at pt. 967, from *luscus*, *luscinius*, although Meyer-Lübke derives it from *lassinare* 'to slide.'

dogma of speech uniformity in Vulgar Latin days, and are prepared to admit, in special cases, survivals of submerged provincial phonology. A Latin *vara*, attested by Pliny with the meaning of 'jackdaw,' and semantically well fitted to bear that meaning, pronounced at an early date as **gara*, with a common development of *v* (cp. *Vapincum* > *Gap*), and the remainder of the word in a form admittedly regular for Tuscan, would account admirably for the numerous *gaya* and *gaggia* forms (cp. *maggio* < *maro*), and standard *gazza* must sink or swim with them. Whatever the place of Fr. *agace* and *geai* may be in this tangled scheme, the latter, in the light of the *pinson*, *mauvins*, and *fauvette* relics in the south, probably accounts for Sicilian *gayu* at pts. 826 and 836 in the 'ghiaidaia' map. Whether *foresta*, at the tip of Calabria, in 'il bosco' (530), and *cuneata* (Fr. *cognée*), in a wide southern belt in 'la scure' (548), are also French is less certain¹, though probable. Norman and Angevin influence in the south has clearly been remarkably enduring, and one is doubtless safe in attributing to it as well the isolated form reminiscent of Fr. *cenelle* at pt. 639 of 'la prugnola' (603) and the *bruyère* forms in Calabria, in 'la scopa' (617).

I would now turn to a number of problems of linguistic geography, in a narrower sense, which are almost immediately discernible throughout the volume, first of all to a few which await investigation and then to others where the maps themselves appear to offer forthwith, at any rate, a partial solution.

'La calce' and 'la calcina' (414, 415): What part, if any, has the existence in Latin of two words *calx* 'heel' and 'lime,' or in Italian of *calce* with the meaning of *calcio* 'kick,' played in the word distribution on these maps?

'Una roccia' (423), 'la parete' (423 a), 'la caverna' (424). The most obvious problem raised by these maps is that of the 'pre-Roman' *crap* for 'rock' in the northern zone. The word, which is almost uniformly *crap* on the 'limestone' map, takes on a number of variant forms, *krep*, *grep*, *grip*, etc., on the 'roccia' map². Particularly interesting is the succession of forms in the Venetian and East Rhetian area: *krep* at 305, *na kroda* 316, *kroda* 317, *uη kret* 327. *Kroda* is clearly *grotta* < *crypta*, which is very frequent, especially in Venetia for 'cliff' (cp. 179, *in groepu dritu*; 187 *ina grot*; 511 *una grot drita*), and by its geographical position *kret* must be *grotta* also (for the gender, cp. 334 *η grot*; 337 *uη kroda*; 323, 325 *la krep*). Similarly, we see, at pt. 307, *na kroda*, between *η krep ert* (*erto*) at 305 and *uη kret ert* at 318. It is difficult to dissociate *krep* at 305 from *crypta*, and the more westerly forms, *grip*, *krap*, *grep*, etc., must go with them. The problem is complicated further by the emergence in map 424, at pt. 329, of *klap* (*sot uη klap*), which brings into the picture Prov. *clap* 'splinter of rock' and Fr. *clapier*. There has clearly been here a great deal of hybridisation, with the Greek *crypta* playing a very important part

¹ *Cuneata* occurs also in Rhetia. Meyer-Lübke says: 'Das Wort ist nur Pikard'; but a glance at ALF 680 shows at once that this is erroneous. It occurs in the west and in a long central strip across France.

² Meyer-Lübke postulates two bases: *grepp*- and *krapp*- or *krepp*-.

beside *cresta*, and possibly *rupem*. It is therefore not impossible that the origin of *crap* is also to be sought in a fusion of *crypta* with a pre-Latin *clap*. If it be demurred that a Greek origin for this type of word is hardly likely, let it be remembered that *spelaeum* and *spelunca* (cp. *špelm* 'cliff' in the Inn valley and *spelunca* 'cave' at pts. 27 and 47, as well as in Sardinia) are both of Greek origin, as well as *scopulum*, which is also very widespread on the 'cliff' map, even in Liguria, and *conca* for 'hollow,' which occurs very widely on the 'avvallamento' map.

Whatever conclusion we may arrive at with regard to *crap* and its confederates, it seems clear that the so-called pre-Roman *tumpa* admitted by Meyer-Lübke to account for southern and Sicilian *tempa*, *tumpa* 'cliff' is to be identified with Greek τέμπεα, τέμπη (cp. Cicero, *Att.* 4, 'Reatinū me ad sua τέμπη duxerunt'). The transference of meaning 'rocky valley' > 'cliff' is not much stranger than that of *crypta* 'cliff' or *vallem* 'river' or 'brook' (cp. maps 429 margin, and 431), and the *i* of the modern words is easily explained as the influence of the final *η* which when its work was done gave way to the normal feminine ending, possibly under the influence of some word of the type of *roccia*.

'La donnola' (438): This map, in addition to its folk-lore interest and the problem it raises as to the replacement of the ancient *mustela*, only traces of which remain, discloses forms identical with Iberian types mapped out by Menendez Pidal in *Los Orígenes*, viz., *kummatrella*, pt. 712, *panakasa*, 576 (cp. also pts. 615 and 646), which must modify the conclusions there drawn with regard to them.

'La lontra' (440) causes us to enquire whether Greek ένυδρίς, given by Meyer-Lübke to explain 'Sicilian' *utria*, is really necessary. We note, by the way, that the *AIS* does not record this form for Sicily, where the otter appears to be unknown, but in the centre and south of the peninsula. The geographical contiguity of the forms *lundria* and *ondria*, *londra* and *ondra*, *utra*, *nutrya* and *lutra*, *itria* and *litria*, and the prevalence of forms in *-ia* from north to south proves conclusively that *utria* is for *litria* with the *l* felt as an article, just as *nutrya* is *utrya* with the agglutination of the *n* of the indefinite article; cp. the series *la nutria* pt. 637, *itra* pt. 648, *la litra* pt. 708. If the Greek word is required at all, in order to explain the forms with *n*, it is required in the Iberian peninsula as well; cp. Port. *lontra*, Sp. *nutr(i)a*, Galic. *londra*.

'L'orbettino' (451): The southern *lengavova* forms are singularly reminiscent of forms for the 'blind-worm' which occur in eastern, south-eastern and southern France: *envoye*, *lanvro*, etc. (v. *ALF*, 952). Whence comes the affinity of these forms? And what is their connexion with *anguis* (cp. *aññda ti kampaña* pt. 819)?

'La raganella' (454) throws no immediate light upon the origin of the rubric, although the frequency of onomatopœic forms might seem to confirm a similar origin for it. It is tempting, however, given the habits of this frog, which when touched spurts out a liquid reputed to be poisonous, to link up its name with the root *rak* 'spit' (Meyer-Lübke, 7017), especially as there are numerous forms with *k* in Umbria. The forms *pisciaccanna* pt. 662, *psakana* 432, on the one hand, and *krakkwələ*

726, *karkarella* 761, etc., *la zgracule* 338, and *skarkababiu* 169 (cp. Prov. *eseracar* 'spit') on the other, confirm this hypothesis.

'Il guscio della chiocciola' (460) has an important bearing upon the problem of Fr. *gousse* and *cosse* as well as of It. *goccia* and *guscio*. Are the forms *kokkya*, *kukkyä*, *koccia*, *koccio*, *goccia*, *goscia*, *guscia* and *guscio*, which it reveals in close geographical proximity, so many variants of the same theme, and is the theme *cochlea*? Was there a *cuchlea* as well as a *cochlea* (cp. Fr. *cuiller*), just as there was *cerasea* and *ceresea*, and, apparently, *usme* and *osme* (v. 'fiutare,' map 520), or is the variety of vowel due to entanglement with *goccia*, itself a form not satisfactorily explained?

'La tignola' (482) raises the question of It. *tarlo* and, incidentally, of Fr. *tarrière*. There seems to have been, in Vulgar Latin, a widespread *tar-* 'to bore,' beside *ter-* 'to rub.' This may have been originally merely a phonological differentiation (cp. *termes* and *tarmes*) before becoming a semantic one. There would therefore appear to be no reason to doubt the existence of a Vulgar Lat. *tarulus* to account for It. *tarlo*.

'Il nido' (515) displays a remarkable and apparently very early instability of intervocalic *d*, which is not without its bearing upon the history of It. *chiodo*.

'Volare' (516): Why is *exvolare* so frequent in the north? Is a **golare* < *volare*, and a consequent entanglement with *gulare* at the back of it?

'La trota' (528): Is Germ. *Lachs* or Latin *lascivus* 'playful' the base of the *la(i)civa* forms for 'trout' in Rhetia? Note that Kluge, s.v. *Forelle*, gives cases where the trout is named after its variegated colouring. The step from 'gay' to 'coquettish' is a short one, semantically.

'Un albero' (533): What linguistic disturbance is betrayed by the widespread *pianta* for 'tree'? What is the weakness of Lat. *arbor* which leads to its replacement? Is it the suggestion of plurality which *arbore* contains in a region where plurals in *-ora* were, and are, frequent? Is it, further, an association with (*h*)*erba* in a domain where *-er* and *-ar* were frequent alternative pronunciations, which would make *pianta*, by the way, a very natural substitute? The frequency of *erbu* forms for 'tree' near the *pianta* domain prevents us from lightly dismissing this possibility. Or is it not, more probably, the entanglement of the dissimilated forms (*l* for *r* in the first syllable), with *albus* derivatives, an entanglement which is so apparent on the 'poplar' map (585)? We note that the *albaru* forms for 'poplar' are thickest near the *pianta* area; and the clash is clearly illustrated at pt. 362, for example, which gives *albaro* for 'poplar' and *albaro* for 'tree,' while at 571 we find an identical *albero* for both.

'L'accetta' (547): Another map simply bristling with problems, minor ones concerning *cuneata* (v. *supra*), *destrale* (Provençal and Sardinian), *manaria* (Provençal and Venetian), and a larger one which concerns not only this map and 'la hache' of the French atlas, but also the maps 'la gazza' and 'il picchio' of the *AIS* and 'la pie' of the *ALF*. This seems at first sight a strange association, but a glance at these maps reveals undeniable interdependence between many of the forms, and shows, a little dimly perhaps, that the unravelling of this interdependence will

throw new light upon a number of puzzling words—among them: Piemontese *apia*, *piola*, Prov. *picasso*, *pigasso*, Fr. *agace*, Prov. *agasso*, It. *gazza*, and even It. *accia*, the connexion of which with Germanic *hapja* would appear, geographically, to be in need of substantiation.

'La sega,' 'la sega lunga,' 'la segatura,' 'segare' (552, 553, 554, 555): These maps give a greater amplitude to the problem studied by Gilhéron and Mongin in their famous pioneer work, *Scier dans la Gaule romaine*, namely the clash of *serrare* 'to saw' with *serare* 'to lock.' Unfortunately, as the 'serrare' map of the *AIS* is not yet published, we are still unable to test Gilliéron's conclusions on the Italian field. One striking fact, well worth further investigation, is immediately revealed, namely, the great extension of the *resicare* area, which is continued on these maps all the way from Provence to Emilia and beyond: witness *rescia* for 'saw' at pt. 528, and *aržgō*, *aršega* at pts. 466 and 467 on the 'balma' map.

'Il ramo' (559): This map should be studied in conjunction with 'il rame,' vol. II, 409, where some interesting results of homophonic clash are revealed, especially in Sicily.

'La foglia' (562): An interesting struggle is here portrayed between *folium*, *-a*, and *frons*, the latter reaching as far north as Umbria and the Marches. A possibility is that a rustic **holium* for *folium* (*h* for *f* was a common rural feature) brought the word too near the orbit of *oleum*. Whether this be so or not, the 'irregularity' of phonetic development which *oleum* reveals in parts of the Romance domain, cp. Fr. *huile*, is significant of some linguistic disturbance, and needs explanation. A more immediate clash is with *lolium*, as reference to the map 'il loglio' (624) at once discloses, with the result that both in Gaul and Italy *lolium* is widely replaced by *ebriaca*¹, Fr. *ivraie*.

'La spina' (563) offers an interesting problem with regard to Tuscany. The remainder of Italy is divided between *spina* and *spinus*, with a great majority for *spina*. Tuscany has both *spina* and *spinus*, but very widely *pruno*, with variants like *stekko* and *brokko*. As there would appear to be no obvious phonological weakness in either *spina* or *spino*, one is led to ask whether there is, or has been, any impropriety attaching to the word, similar to that attaching to a corresponding word in English, which would account for its avoidance by the dialects; cp. the disappearance of *conil* for 'rabbit' in France. The word *spina* is applied to a number of technological devices and implements which lend colour to this view.

So far the burden of these observations has been distressingly interrogative. Fortunately one is able to end on a more positive note and refer to a few maps which enlighten us immediately on a number of interesting etymological points.

'Il bruco' (481): This map, a very fascinating one, seems to bring the solution of the etymological problem of It. *bigatto*. In the naming of the caterpillar both the cat and the dog are frequently drawn upon, cp. Fr. *chenille*, and O.F. *chatte peleuse*, and on this map both appear: the dog

¹ The representatives of *lolium* would clash with representatives of *oculum* in certain areas, particularly in France.

on the French border and in Bergamasque, and the cat almost everywhere in the north-west, *gata*, *gatula*, *gatascia*, etc. Now near the *gatta* area are frequent examples of *baco*, with an *e* as the local phonology requires: *bek* (pt. 412) *beqa* (286), etc.; not far from these occur the hybrids *bigat* (439), *i biget* (466). The conclusion is irresistible that *bigatto* is also a fusion of *beco* (= *baco*) and *gatto*. The first element of the new word loses its identity owing to the more picturesque value of the second portion and takes on the ordinary form in Italian of protonic *e*. Such fusions and hybridisations are very common in this volume, e.g., *larmiola* < *anima* + *medulla* on the 'pith' map, *larzina* < *larice* + *resina* on the 'resin' map, etc., and are particularly numerous in this map and the next; e.g., *kamula* (< Gr. κάμψη) and *gatula* in close proximity (pts. 254, 263), *ruca*, *ruga* (< *eruca*) as *bruga* at pt. 555 or as *caruga*, either from crossing with *kamula* or with *caries* derivatives (pts. 413, 414) and on map 482, *tarma*, *tarpa*, *karpa*, *parma*, where *termes*, *talpa* and the *car*-root criss-cross in an astonishing variety of forms. It is this important consideration which makes one suspect the Greek origin of *bruco* itself and incline to see in it a fusion of *baco* and *ruca*, which is geographically very probable indeed.

'La pernice' (510): *d* forms, from Latino-Greek *perducem*, are found on this map near the Provençal frontier and in Sardinia. Elsewhere it is the form with *n* that prevails. That the *n* is due to crossing with *coturnix* would seem to be proved beyond question by *kuturnige* for 'partridge' at pt. 547, and *pernige* at pt. 556; cp. also *kuturna* in north Lombardy at pt. 237.

'Fiutare' (520): The absence of standard *fiutare* is a striking feature of this map. The word is evidently *fiatare* with a *u* due to contact with another word, most probably *usmare*, and is analogous to the form *ustare* which is *usmare* with a *t* due to *fiatare*. With the new vowel it is a useful specialised form of *fiatare* and like *bigatto* and *lampone* (v. *infra*), shows the northern influence on standard Italian.

'La lisca' (527): The map 'arête,' no. 55 of the *ALF*, shows for this word a number of *k* forms, in Picardy and Normandy, of the type *erek*. This fact and the frequency of corresponding *k* forms (*la resca*) which are found broadcast from Lombardy to Sicily, side by side with much fewer *t* forms (*la resta*), show clearly that Vulgar Latin used beside *arista* a word *arisca* which owes its *c* to the word of kindred meaning *spica*. This *arisca* is at the back of both the northern French and the Italian forms. Now, as Tuscan *lisca* is surrounded by forms which derive from either *arista* or *arisca*, it would be in the nature of a geographical miracle if *lisca* were an independent word, going back, as Meyer-Lübke says, to a Germanic *liska* 'reed.' It is, for example, impossible to dissociate *la lisca* of pt. 581 from *la riska* of pt. 582, and this from *la resta* of 583. One Tuscan point (553) has actually sing. *una resta*, pl. *liske*! *Lisca* is therefore bound up with all these rival or co-existent forms. The key to the problem is, I feel sure, to be found in the margin of map 524 ('l'amo'), where the words for 'bait' are given. Here one reads, accompanied by a quite unjustifiable query mark, *la leska*, at pts. 511 and 546. There has clearly been entanglement of a *lesca* form with *esca* plus the agglutinated article, and

then disentanglement by means of a change of vowel, determined no doubt by the presence of the widespread alternative *spina*.

'Si spacca' (540): According to Meyer-Lübke the word comes from a Langobardic *spakhan*. Here again linguistic geography seems to say 'no.' It is difficult to dissociate the *scāpa* forms, cognate with Prov. *esclapar* 'to split' which are found everywhere in the north and which penetrate into Tuscany, cp. *si styapa* at pt. 520, from the *spakka* forms which are universal almost from Tuscany southwards. The Tuscan equivalent of Prov. *esclapar* is *schappare*, given by Petrocchi, and traces of this are found in Tuscany and farther south on the 'scheggia' map (537). Moreover, looking southwards, if one compares the treatment of the initial group of consonants with the treatment of *sp* or *st* in the 'spina' and 'stornello' maps (563, 500), one is struck by the great number of palatalised forms, actually going to *yakka* in some dialects, which 'si spacca' displays. One suspects, therefore, that Tuscan and central *spaccure* is a metathesised form of *schappare*, due possibly to the interference of *scappare*, and has nothing to do with any Langobardic word. It is worth noting that this type of word, with its onomatopœic values, is quite susceptible of irregular and even violent sound change.

'Il faggio' (578): The geographical situation of this word is such that recourse to the adjective *fageus* to explain it seems scarcely necessary. To north and south it is surrounded by forms going back to the noun *fagum* weakened to *fao*. I would suggest, and the suggestion is confirmed by various adjacent forms which occur on the map, a development somewhat as follows: *fao*, pl. *far*, whence a singular *fayo* giving *faggio*, as *maio* gives *maggio*, and possibly **gara*, *gaggia*.

'Il lampone' (611): We end with what is perhaps the clearest solution of all. The 'raspberry' map of the *ALF* (609) shows us that Germanic *Himbeere* appears in many parts of France, e.g., *ābr* in the Ardennes, *ōbra* in the Puy-de-Dôme, and is particularly frequent along the eastern frontier, where it is the prevailing word, and is found as *āp*, *āpa*, *āpwa*, *āmpoere*, etc. This area is prolonged in the *AIS* all over the north of Italy with forms like *ampora* (144), *ampia* (46), etc. Here it encounters a domain where *poma* forms occur, *poma* being a word of much more elastic connotation in Italy than in Gaul (cp. *i pumali* (pt. 234), *i pomele* (pt. 238) for 'mirtilli rossi,' map 614) and we find for example, for 'raspberries,' *i pumet* (pt. 216), *le pomele* (311); cp. Rhetian *la puewna*, *la puawna* (pts. 1, 10, etc.). The fusion of these rival forms produces a great number of hybrids: *ampomola* (331, etc.), *le ampome*, a collective plural (340, etc.). We are thus led irresistibly to postulate a form **lampome*, with agglutinated article, as the immediate ancestor of Italian *lampone*, whose suffix, otherwise unintelligible, becomes simply an attempt to familiarise an unfamiliar ending. Many cases of such fusion, we have seen, occur in this volume (cf. 'il bruco,' above). The most appropriate example to quote here is the frequent *bacoccole* 'berries' < *bacca* + *coccole*, which occur in map 612, 'la coccola del ginepro.'

JOHN ORR.

De Renaissance in Spanje: Kultuur, Litteratuur, Leven. Door G. J. GEERS en J. BROUWER. Zutphen: W. J. Thieme. 1932. viii + 383 pp. With 88 photographs.

Dr Geers has made an attempt to bring together and revalue all that we have recently learned concerning the social and cultural conditions of Spain during the Golden Age. His first five chapters are historical and summarise Spanish history up to the time of Philip IV. Dr Brouwer contributes a sixth chapter on literature and an eleventh on men and society in the Golden Age as inferred from the literature of the time, and especially from the Lopean drama. Dr Geers discusses the arts (architecture, sculpture, painting and music) in the intervening chapters. The eighty-eight photographs are used to illustrate the arts. Each is of the size of a full page, and all are very clear.

De Renaissance in Spanje is neither a work of original investigation nor a popular educator, but something between the two. The scale is rather larger, and the style rather more sober, than the general reader is supposed to welcome. On the other hand, the topics are so numerous and important in themselves, that each would require the whole space to be treated in full detail. The service the authors perform is that of bringing together a great deal of reliable information from modern scholarship, and giving us our only general statement of cultural conditions in the Golden Age. This is what differentiates *De Renaissance in Spanje* from Pfandl's suggestive work, which is restricted to literature, or Professor Merriman's account of Charles V, which is mainly political in content; while the authors' attempt to treat the whole subject marks their book off from the monographs of Mr Aubrey Bell, which are the nearest English equivalent.

In the opening chapter Dr Geers alludes to the custom of denying to Spain any share in the Renaissance. It is usual to adopt some quite arbitrary criterion, such as 'paganism' or 'breach with the Middle Ages,' and to ask whether the condition is found in Spain. It is not; therefore Spain had no Renaissance! These criteria scarcely apply to any country. 'Neo-paganism' was not adopted, as Professor Macneile Dixon has shown, by England; it has nothing to do with Erasmus or Vives or Calvin or Rafael or Tasso. Yet these are figures in any Renaissance worth the name. In the broadest sense the Renaissance is the hinge between the distinctively mediæval and the modern world, and, whatever its total duration, its critical moment was the sixteenth century. Several of the most significant changes took place at that time on Spanish soil and as a result of Spanish or Portuguese enterprise: the discovery of the New World and of the route to India; the organisation of transoceanic empires; the new national spirit; standing armies; empirical knowledge of botany, zoology, geography and other physical sciences; etc. We have no right, therefore, to ask, with Klemperer, 'Gibt es eine spanische Renaissance?' judging the case by some ready-made definition of 'Renaissance.' We must go to Spain, as well as to Italy—the joint action of Spain and Italy being the most notable feature of the age—to ask what the Renaissance was. It was not neo-paganism, which was a disease,

nor did it imply a breach with the Middle Ages; but it meant the sudden enrichment and amplification of all human effort in a new liberty of thought and action.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. Von GUSTAV EHRLSMANN. Erster Teil: *Die althochdeutsche Literatur*. Zweite durchgearbeitete Auflage. München: C. H. Beck. 1932. xii + 474 pp. 13 M. 50.

Professor Ehrismann is to be heartily congratulated on the demand for a second edition of the first part of his book even before he has finished writing his work.

The present volume shows that he has spared no pains to improve his work. The first edition seemed to offer little scope for improvement, and we should have been content with a reprint and an appendix containing new matter. But Ehrismann seems to have reconsidered every sentence. Here and there a word has been omitted or added, and occasionally a sentence has been rewritten to obtain greater clarity or a more pleasing rhythm.

The general plan of the book needs no description. It remains the same. The valuable bibliography has been made more valuable by the inclusion of contributions to the subject which have appeared since the first edition was published, and the excellent method of arranging the bibliography remains unaltered. But, although so much has been published on Old High German literature in recent years, it is striking to notice how little modification has been required in Ehrismann's history. All this effort seems to have produced but little real progress.

We might, perhaps, have expected a completely new account of Germanic alliterative verse (pp. 74-7), but Ehrismann was no doubt wise in making no attempt to describe the new systems of Sievers and of Heusler. Their systems are too subjective to be described in a few pages, and for statistical purposes the old 'types' still serve their purpose. Ehrismann still says: 'Die Langzeile hat normalerweise zwei [Stäbe] in der ersten Halbzeile...zuweilen steht in der ersten Halbzeile nur ein Stab' (p. 76); but since in *Beowulf* double alliteration is only slightly more frequent than simple alliteration, whilst in *Genesis A* it is actually less frequent, 'zuweilen' seems the wrong word to use. Here we might mention, perhaps, the discussion of the first verse of the first *Merseburg Charm* (p. 101). Ehrismann is inclined to take *hera* as *era*, thus *sāzun hera duoder* (*sie setzten sich über die Erde hin*), but hesitates: 'allerdings läge der Stab nicht auf der ersten Hebung des zweiten Halbverses.' This hesitation is difficult to understand. The reading *era* would give us a C verse of a kind common enough in Old English.

The most important new matter in the revised edition is the following:

In the Charm *Ad signandum domum* (p. 116) Ehrismann now reads *chnospinci* instead of *chuospinci*, and his suggestion that we have here 'ein geheimsprachliches Wort' seems preferable to Steinmeyer's inter-

pretation. In the *Hildebrandslied* (pp. 121–37) the arguments of Hermann Schneider and Georg Baesecke in favour of its Gothic-Bavarian origin find general acceptance. The former explanation of the word *muspill* is omitted, and we read: ‘Das germanische Wort *mutspell*, *muspell* ist etymologisch noch nicht geklärt’ (p. 149). The direct source of the second part of *Muspill* is now the Old English *Crist* (p. 152), and not a Latin sermon. The translations of Isidorus and of St Matthew are now ascribed to two workers (p. 285)—in the first edition they were ascribed to one. The relation of the Saxon, Fulda and Reichenau *Beichten* to one another is worked out in greater detail (pp. 323–5). An attempt to interpret the symbolism of the *Abececlarium Nordmannicum* is made (p. 362).

Few misprints have been noticed. On page 27 we should read *bord-zelac* for *bord elac*; some stress-marks are omitted on *Eiris sázun idisi* (p. 75) and *griuiet imo up thanan* (p. 76); *fur aet* (p. 76) should be *furlaet*, and (*pseudorhabanische*) on page 156 should be (*pseudo*)-*rhabanische*.

The publishers and printers have vied with the author to make the good even better. In many cases where the text remains unaltered the spacing of the words has been changed to produce a more pleasing effect. The book is printed in beautiful, clear Roman type on good paper. For such a book the price is very low.

A. C. DUNSTAN.

SHEFFIELD.

Heimskringla, or the Lives of the Norse Kings. By SNORRE STURLASON.

Edited with notes by ERLING MONSEN and translated into English with the assistance of A. H. SMITH. Cambridge: W. Heffer. 1932. xxxviii + 770 pp. 18s.

Heimskringla appears here in what is certainly its handsomest English form, for which the publishers and Mr Monsen are alike to be thanked. It is beautifully produced, with good maps and other illustrations, including the bold engravings inset in the text and the Mercator map which has been utilised for end-papers. The translation is straightforward, and usually avoids the two opposite faults of undue Latinisation and pretentious archaism which beset the translator from Old Norse. It has one trick irritating to an English reader, of giving the personal names in modern forms which have a Scandinavian rather than an English appearance and seem out of place in an English version. Mr Monsen pleads that he is following ‘the present practice,’ but it is not the present practice of the country whose language is nearest to Snorri’s own, nor is it the present English practice. The English translators may not always have been strictly consistent in their usage, but such names as Thord, Thorleif, Snorri, are familiar to and pronounceable by an Englishman who knows nothing of the old language: Tord, Torleiv, Snorre, look odd to him, he does not know how to pronounce them—and he will certainly not pronounce them according to ‘the present practice’—and it is difficult to see why they should be forced upon him, since they are further from the original forms than his own versions. The introduction and footnotes show rather more enthusiasm than strict scholarship, and

there are some odd slips, e.g., the confidence with which a meaning is supplied for the word *Edda* (p. xiv n.) and the statement that the O N. forms are Bjornsson and Sigurdsson (p. xxxi). But when this is said, the book remains a noble and desirable volume.

EDITH C. BATHO.

LONDON.

The Theory of Speech and Language. By ALAN H. GARDINER. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1932. x + 332 pp. 10s. 6d.

Dr Gardiner is already widely known as the author of a standard grammar of Ancient Egyptian. His interest in general linguistic problems has, hitherto, been manifested chiefly in two articles, one in *Man* (1919) and the other in the *British Journal of Psychology*, xii, which, in spite of their brevity, are full of stimulating ideas.

The work under review falls into two divisions. The first expounds general theory and the second deals specifically with the theory of the sentence as a prelude to further problems to be treated in another volume. The purpose of the work as a whole is to inquire 'what language is and how speech works,' a formula in which the contrast between language and speech and between their accompanying verbs is charged with significance and is ever present to the author's mind. To use his own words (p. 62): 'With infinite pains the human child learns language [the collective product of the community] in order to exercise it as speech [the activity of the individual].' To him the unit of language is the word, whereas the unit of speech is the sentence. His distinction between 'language' (*la langue*) and 'speech' (*la parole*) will not meet with universal approval, but it is one which corresponds to the facts of experience. A 'standard' language is not simply the sum of the speech-usages of the community at a given time, for it embodies the choices—sometimes deliberate—of certain leading members and—as set forth in dictionaries and grammars—is regarded both as a repository (cf. Ger. *Wortschatz*) and a corrective.

Dr Gardiner gives full weight to the social origins of speech and follows Wegener in stressing the importance of the listener in the speaking transaction. He protests against the ambiguous use of the word 'meaning' in many linguistic treatises, showing how it straddles both 'word-meaning' (a part of language ascertainable in the dictionary) and 'thing-meant' (for which Messrs Ogden and Richards use 'referent' and Miss Stebbing in her *Logic* proposes 'referend'). Words are said either to express the class of the thing-meant or to qualify a thing-meant in the manner in which a predicate adjective might qualify it (p. 37). A word like *horse* applicable to various things-meant, e.g., a vaulting-horse or towel-horse, is said to have a certain 'area of meaning' (cf. *Bedeutungsumfang*). In such diversified areas a visual image, say of a prancing steed, is a hindrance rather than a help. The author does not think that images have any importance for linguistic theory and therefore does not discuss the relations of 'verbal' images to visual, auditory and kinaesthetic images or assess their comparative values for thought. The reviewer has

often found in practice that in comparing the finer shades of words (e.g., *an den Strand*, *zum Strand*), it is helpful to get various speakers to evoke images of concrete situations. The minimum of imagery will be associated with mechanised or stereotyped expressions, e.g., formulas like *Don't mention it*, set phrases like *to hold one's tongue*, the use of the definite article in *The Sun* and its omission in *Hell*. A familiar situation is apt to set free—or as the French say more picturesquely 'déclencher'—a whole series of linked mechanisms with but little conscious effort or even awareness. Dr Gardner shows clearly and cogently by means of a concrete example—the communication by a speaker to a listener of the fact that it is raining outside—the 'modus operandi' of a simple act of speech. By a series of pictures he makes us realise the importance of the 'situation,' which includes both the physical position of the partners and their background of common experience, a background modified by each successive utterance. A diagram shows clearly the cycle of activities starting with a physical stimulus (the falling rain), realisation of thing-meant (classing of visual or auditory phenomenon as 'rain'), utterance (*Rain!*), perception of utterance by listener and realisation of its purport, reaction of listener issuing in utterance (*What a bore!*). We can see how 'language' enters into 'speech' in so far as the English speaker might say *Rain!* or *Raining!* or *It is raining*, but hardly *rains* or *it rains*, whereas the German could say *Regen!* or *Es regnet!*, but not *regnend*. Each of these examples is a distinct 'word-form,' i.e., 'a special kind of meaning which attaches to words over and above their radical meaning' and indicates singularity, present time, etc. 'Word-form' is thus analogous to Otto's term 'Beziehungsbedeutung.' The problem at once arises: is there such a thing as 'inner word-form,' i.e., an awareness of the grammatical function of a given word, even when no specific outer word-form for the function is used? An Englishman feels *sheep* or *fish* as plurals when he prefixes *many* or uses a plural verb or when he thinks of outward plural forms like *ewes* or *haddocks* used in the same syntactic position. A problem which would repay investigation is the extent to which a Chinaman is aware of grammatical distinctions in his own language in the absence of all apparent outward differentiation. The comparative ease with which Chinamen learn to manipulate the outwardly differentiated speech-categories in Esperanto indicates a feeling for functional distinctions not too deeply submerged to 'break surface.' Incongruence of form and function extends to the sentence as well, e.g., when a request is put in the form of a question or a statement, and to word-meaning in metaphor. The author's dismissal of the idea that metaphor has its *historical* origin in simile is borne out by child-speech, always ready to form such spontaneous metaphors as *roses* for the disks of lather falling from the shaving-brush, or *spinning-tops* for the whorl-like splashes of rain falling into a puddle.

In Part II (the Sentence) the author makes good use of Bühler's classification of sentence-functions as 'Kundgabe' (for which 'manifestation' is the nearest English equivalent) issuing in exclamations serving to abreact the speaker's own inner tension, 'Auslösung' (a mechanical

metaphor, 'release,' 'impulsion'), issuing in either questions or requests addressed to the listener (second person) and 'Darstellung,' i.e., 'representation,' issuing in objective statement (third person). The author draws a distinction between the special 'sentence-quality' of an utterance, i.e., the typical expression of its function, the 'sentence-function' itself, i.e., the work which a given sentence does through the co-operation of the listener who, for instance, hearing a child say *Butterbrot!* in a whimpering tone, concludes that the word stands for an exclamatory request, and the 'sentence-form' by which each function is normally fulfilled, e.g., *gib mir ein Butterbrot!* Sentence-forms may be 'locutional' if solely dependent on words, or 'elocutional' if dependent principally on intonation. Incongruence between locutional and elocutional forms is perceived in the pronunciation of a sentence with ironic intention.

Much of this part of the book is taken up with an analysis and criticism of views on the sentence advanced by Wundt, J. Ries and others. To Dr Gardiner the single word *Rain!* in its own situation is, *pace* Ries, just as good a sentence as *Look at the rain!* Ries would call *Rain!* a 'Satzwort,' i.e. one of those words 'die in satzähnlicher Weise der Darstellung dienen, zur Mitteilung verwendet werden' (*Was ist ein Satz?* p. 185). It is all a matter of the weight to be given to sentence-function on the one hand and sentence-form on the other, and the choice will be guided by an initial bias in favour of the psychological (notional) or of the grammatical. If we agree with A. Nehring (*Zeitschr. für vergl. Sprachforschung*, LV, p. 269) that a sentence is the expression for each fresh ordering by a speaker of a given manifold of states of things, then we may grant at least that the 'optimum' sentence-form will show both a subject and a predicate. In point of fact, however, we frequently omit the subject in a subjective exclamation like *How pretty!* adding it only if challenged, and in an imperative like *Go there!* where we do not need to specify the subject (our listener) except to make a contrast, e.g., *You go there and let him remain.* It is noteworthy that even such 'minima' as *Fire!* or *Thieves!* tend to focus on themselves the intonation they would receive as predicates of a fully organised sentence with subject expressed, *Fire!* being tonally differentiated as a military command from its use as referring to a conflagration. If the functional point of view be adopted, a difficulty arises—as Dr Gardiner is aware—in the case of subordination, e.g., *he is well in I hope he is well*, in which the whole complex (*I hope he is well*) has a single sentence-function, whereas both *I hope* and *he is well* have locutional sentence-form (but not elocutional!). In any longer utterance we can demarcate wholes of varying size and complexity, e.g., *He could not come. He was ill* > *he could not come, he was ill* > *he could not come, for (because) he was ill.* The larger whole, which Junker in the *Streitberg-Festschrift*, pp. 22 ff. calls 'die Rede,' often influences the form or prescribes the connectives and particles used in the compound 'sentences,' cf. C. W. Mendell, *Latin Sentence Connection*, New Haven, 1917. English helps us out of the terminological difficulty by providing us with the word 'clause' for the formal unit (cf. the present work, p. 183), so that there is less objection to using 'sentence' for the functional unit.

Dr Gardiner's treatise is chiefly valuable for its sturdy common sense and the clarity of its style. It is vivified by many apt instances especially from English. It is the work of a thoughtful linguist rather than of a philosopher or psychologist of speech, and hence it disregards certain important problems, e.g., the part played by speech in the organisation of thought in the individual and in the race (cf. L. Weisgerber's utilisation of the data of colour amnesia in the *Germ.-Rom. Monatsschrift*, xiv, pp. 241 ff.); the problem of 'losing the thread' (cf. R. Hönigswald in *Grundlagen der Denkpsychologie*); the bearing of 'fictions' and 'symbolic distance' on language (cf. S. Buchanan, *Symbolic Distance*, London, 1932 and C. K. Ogden's edition of Bentham's *Theory of Fictions*, London, 1932), and the basis of translation, i.e., the nature of the 'common denominator' which makes transference from one language to another possible at all, and the criteria of equivalence. However, we may well be grateful for what is given and look forward with pleasurable anticipation to the next volume.

W. E. COLLINSON.

LIVERPOOL.

Todd Memorial Volumes. Philological Studies. Edited by JOHN D. FITZGERALD and PAULINE TAYLOR. 2 volumes. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1930 (issued 1932). xiv + 266 and viii + 264 pp. 62s. 6d.

The *Todd Memorial Volumes* were undertaken in 1926 by an editorial committee, to which a business committee was added in 1927. The preliminary matter includes a biography of the late Professor H. A. Todd, which lays stress on his sincerity and conscientious industry. To this are attached a brief bibliography and a series of personal tributes by American scholars. The forty essays in linguistics and literature bear mainly on Romance philology and the literatures of Spain, Spanish America, France and Italy.

Philology. L. H. Gray suggests (with twenty-five examples) that Romance etyma could be profitably carried back to the Indo-European stage. He takes for text the second edition of Meyer-Lubke's *Wörterbuch*. Miss Taylor analyses the semantics and syntax of the *Liber historiae francorum*. The Spanish and Gascon change of $F > h$ is connected by H. F. Muller rather with the period of Basque predominance than with the (probable) aspirate in 'Iberian,' it being an imitation of the Basque accent by neighbouring speakers of Romance. He denies the Oscan features of Aragonese alleged by Menéndez Pidal in the *Orígenes*. J. D. Fitzgerald derives Fr. *comment* < 'quomodo' + '[qua]mente.' Miss D. Turville writes on Italian feminine singulars derived from Latin neuter plurals. G. Cirot connects *ser* and *estar* before participles with the distinction between imperfective and perfective. R. Menéndez Pidal writes on Spanish derivatives of 'character' (Ast. *calter*, *caltre*, Santander *calatre*, *caletre*). F. de Onís reproduces old notes on the dialect of S. Martín de Trevejo, where the language is fundamentally Portuguese, yet allied in many points with the Leonese of Trevejo and other villages.

F. Boas makes a serviceable summary of Spanish influences in modern Nahuatl. Owing to the evolution of Spanish since the conquest, the borrowings show strata, and the same is shown by sounds that have gradually been learned in loan words by Nahuatl (*xenola* for *señora*, but with a modern *r* in *desea-roa*, etc.). M. A. Luna has a note on Judeo-Spanish dialects of New York City. G. O. Russell pleads the cause of the International Phonetic Alphabet as 'international research symbols' comparable to those used in chemistry!

French and Provençal Literatures. The Provençal essays are two: by J. Anglade on the doctrines of the *Gai Savoir*, and by W. P. Shepard on Aimeric de Pegulhan's 'A for de captaher lial' and 'Qui souffrir s'en pogues.' The French articles affect Hardy's *Mort d'Achille* (compared with *Henry V* by H. C. Lancaster), Corneille (J. B. Segall), Prévost's critics (H. Kurz), two deistic poems by Voltaire (printed by G. L. van Roosbroeck), Diderot's *Leçons de Clavecin* (F. Vexler), Gérard de Nerval's germanism (M. Rudwin), and Cabanis (F. M. Warren). A. D. Menut discusses the theme of the 'melancholy princesse' in V. Hugo, Samain and Rubén Darío.

Italian Literature. J. B. Fletcher writes on 'Dante, Æneas, St Paul,' starting from 'Io non Enea, io non Paolo sono' (*Inf.* ii, 32), and citing many texts to explain the differences involved. C. H. Grandgent writes on 'lo bello stilo' (*Inf.* i, 87) with reference to the precepts of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*. Miss R. S. Phelps discusses Petrarch's forms of address, and P. Rajna writes on Boiardo. There is an essay on the bestiary in the third book of Cecco d'Ascoli's *Acerba* by J. P. Rice.

Spanish, Portuguese, and Spanish American Literatures. Authors discussed are Lope de Vega (his *Médico de su honra*, H. C. Heaton), Urrea and his *Orlando* (J. van Horne), the grotesque in Rivas and García Gutiérrez (N. B. Adams), Palacio Valdés (W. A. Beardsley), Jiménez Rueda (H. A. Holmes), Eça de Queiroz (L. E. V. Sylvania). D. S. Blondheim reprints the *Livro de como se fazem as cores*. There are also articles on American travellers in Spain (C. Evangeline Farnham), and the Mexican Inquisition between 1654 and 1669 (Miss H. Phipps).

Other subjects. L. Feraru writes on Văcărescu. There is an article on Renaissance Latin Literature (C. Ruutz-Rees). 'Ingemann and Long-fellow' (D. K. Dodge) and a note on *Richard III* (L. F. Mott) represent English studies, and C. A. Manning has an article of some length on Ivan the Terrible's treatment of his sons as recorded in the Russian *byliny*.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

SHORT NOTICES

Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages, No. 1, 1932 (5s. per annum), is an enterprise of a new kind to which a cordial welcome should be given. It is an attempt to make public some of the chief results of research work done in the Department of English of the University by staff and students, but mainly by the latter, when that work has not been published in independent form. It covers a wide range of interest. Two of the articles show the need for a new collation of such well-known texts as the *Vespasian Psalter* and the M.E. lyrics of Harleian MS. 2253; two deal with Icelandic problems, and illustrate the lively interest in Scandinavian studies initiated in Leeds by Professors Tolkien and E. V. Gordon, and now carried on by Professor Bruce Dickinson; the last-named scholar sets out a simple but accurate and effective method of transliterating English runic inscriptions, and shows how the runic *Epa* on O.E. coins is probably for *Eppa*, a pet form of the name of *Eorþweald*, king of East Anglia; Mr R. M. Wilson deals with the authorship of the Katherine Group of M.E. homilies; Mr Walter Taylor, rejecting seven of the theories which have been advanced as to the origin of the name *Saracens*, advances strong grounds for believing that this was originally the name of a Bedouin tribe, the *Sarakenoi*, who lived in the peninsula of Sinai in a district called *Saraka* (identical with the *Sarakene* of Ptolemy), and that this became a generalised name for the Muslims, much as all Europeans came to be known in the East as Franks; Mr A. S. C. Ross is the most ambitious contributor in his 'Outline of a Theory of Language,' brief in form but fundamental in its consideration of some of the outstanding problems of linguistic history.

A. M.

Those who have followed the recent work that has been done upon *The Court of Sapience* will welcome *The Sources of the Court of Sapience* by Dr C. F. Bühler (*Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*, xxiii, Leipzig; Tauchnitz. 1932. 95 pp. 4 M.), a most careful and thorough enquiry into the sources of that remarkable poem which was until recently attributed to Lydgate. Its author was essentially a scholar who collected a vast quantity of information from numerous sources and made out of it a sort of literary mosaic, devoid of any great poetical merit. Dr Bühler exercises great discrimination in isolating the various sources of the allegorical material which centres round the four daughters of God and the castle of Sapience where Theology dwells with the seven sisters, and is alive to the many pitfalls which beset the path of anyone who seeks to unravel such complicated problems. While some of the conclusions are not new, the work as a whole breaks new ground. There are ample references, and the argument is always well substantiated by adequate examples. The incidental value of this book is also great, for it throws new light on several aspects of mediæval allegory. It forms an indispensable companion to Dr Spindler's critical text of 1927 in the same series.

J. P. O.

Christmas Carols printed in the Sixteenth Century, edited by Edward Bliss Reed (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1932. lxiv + 104 pp. \$4.00) consists of an admirable introductory essay by the editor and facsimiles of the whole of Kele's *Christmas carolles newly Inprynted*, of all the other known pages of English carols printed in the sixteenth century, and of the carol with music from *Bassus*. The unique copy of Kele's *Christmas carolles* is preserved in the Huntington Library, and, if it were not unique, would not be of extraordinary interest. The facsimiles in this volume are beautifully done, but the carols themselves are not of the best, and few are of any special interest. The first may be excepted, being a translation from a Scots poem and so parallel to the 1577 English translation of Henryson's *Fables*; *Gaudeamus synge we* in this late version differs from the earlier in making St John the first speaker and in giving an almost inspired misprint, if it is a misprint and not of earlier origin, in 'this game of loue' for the earlier 'this game alone'; *My lady went to Canterbury*, especially in its last stanza, is cheerful nonsense; but there is little else that is really interesting. What is of interest and value is, first the evidence which these few printed survivals give of the popularity and nature of the carol in the sixteenth century, and still more the Introduction, in which Mr Reed sets out this evidence clearly and draws some legitimate conclusions from it. The book is an excellent example of the valuable critical work which can be done on an apparently unpromising text.

E. C. B.

In his *Spenser and the Table Round* (*Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature*, VIII. 1932. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 13s.) Mr C. B. Millican presents 'a study in the contemporaneous background of Spenser's use of the Arthurian legend.' 'In its broadest sense', he writes, 'Spenser's use of the Arthurian Legend is a feature of the antiquarian movement which derived its impetus from the vigorous nationalistic policy of Henry VII.' Antiquarianism there is in plenty in this industrious compilation of facts. Mr Millican's themes are, the genealogy of the Tudors in relation to their political and imperial pretensions; the controversy, from Polydore Vergil to Camden, as to the authenticity of the Arthurian tradition, and its bearing on Scottish and Welsh affairs; popular interest as reflected in the 'Knights of Prince Arthures Round Table' or Society of Archers, to which Mulcaster belonged. Although it tells us little new of Spenser or his poetry, the book certainly helps to place the *Faerie Queene* 'in historical perspective' by assembling particular instances of what was already apparent in general, the widespread Elizabethan cult of Arthur and Brut.

G. B.

In his pamphlet, *Harrington and the Jews* (Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup; London: H. Milford. 1932. 28 pp. 1 kr. 15 ö.), Professor S. B. Liljegren has brought together much valuable information on the interest in Jews and Jewish learning during the age of Milton. The three main topics treated are the question of the readmission of the

Jews into England under Cromwell, Harrington's proposal (in connexion with that readmission) for settling the Irish question, and the interest taken by Harrington and his contemporaries in the history, institutions and traditional learning of the Jews.

The increasing Hebraism of English religious thought, as represented by the Puritan movement, had brought the English and the Jews together. The Jewish community in Amsterdam had been in contact with the English separatists since the sixteenth century, and had followed the course of the civil war in England—first the victory of Parliament and then of the Independents—with growing interest. The Puritans on their part, drawing their inspiration from the Old Testament, had come to identify their history with that of the early Jews; Hebraic institutions and the levitical legislation were held up by many of the reformers as patterns to be imitated in England. The mutual interest and sympathy thus created were reinforced by the growth of the idea of religious toleration among the Independents; as early as 1614 Busher had included the Jews in his plan of religious liberty, and after the civil war several writers urged that the chosen people should no longer be persecuted in England. For the not inconsiderable number who expected God's Kingdom on Earth to be shortly established these religious reasons for welcoming the Jews back were urgent and overwhelming. There were also commercial arguments in its favour: the industry and wealth of the Jews would be useful to any country receiving them. Lastly the Jews could be made of great political use: being a kind of international trading society, with ramifications throughout Europe, they could also serve as political spies and informers. Burnet states that Cromwell did so use them as an intelligence corps. All these arguments were of course double-edged and were employed in a contrary sense by the many who resisted the proposal to readmit the Jews.

It must be allowed that it was a brilliant notion of Harrington's to kill two birds with one stone by settling the Jews in Ireland. One wonders whether there would have been any Irish problem for our times if the suggestion had been acted on.

The general interest in Hebraic thought and institutions had led naturally to an interest in the oral traditions of the Jews collected in the Talmud. In all the varied controversies of the time people sought for arguments in rabbinical literature. Professor Liljegren, however, considers that the learning thus generally displayed was for the most part neither sound nor deep; there were but few scholars like Selden who were really well versed in this literature. The primary source of most of the information was Buxtorfius' handbook on the subject, *Synagoga Judaica*; to Buxtorfius and a few other genuine Hebrew scholars (such as Selden, Grotius, Gerson) is due the display of rabbinical learning in Harrington and his contemporaries. According to Professor Liljegren, Milton comes into this category of pseudo-hebraists: 'the efforts to prove that Milton was a Hebrew scholar with extensive first-hand knowledge of the rabbis, are futile.'

B. A. W.

JOHN GEORGE ROBERTSON

BORN 18 JANUARY 1867. DIED 28 MAY 1933
FOUNDER OF THE *MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW* AND
CHIEF EDITOR SINCE 1903

THE deeply lamented death of Professor Robertson has deprived the *Modern Language Review* of its founder, who has supervised its production without a break for twenty-eight years of devoted and skilful service. It is fitting that the *Review* should set forth some record of the man, the scholar, and the editor.

Professor Robertson was pre-eminently one of those men whom to know was to love. His intellectual gifts, his brilliant scholarship and wide field of knowledge (extending far beyond the subjects that he had made especially his own) were linked to a singular gentleness of manner and character, an unselfish generosity in working with his collaborators and for his students, and an even excessive modesty—shown, for example, in the sincere astonishment with which he heard of his election to the fellowship of the British Academy. Yet other honours had fallen to him of rare significance abroad as well as in England. As German scholar the Gold Medal for Kunst und Wissenschaft came to him from Germany. As Director of Scandinavian Studies in University College, London, Norway and Sweden honoured him with the knighthoods of the Orders of St Olaf and of the Northern Star.

Among his published books, three stand out in particular. His *History of German Literature* (1902), of which a new edition was published in 1931, holds its place as the standard work of its kind in English: a model of what such a volume should be. His revised and enlarged *Life of Goethe* was one of the most noteworthy contributions to the centenary celebrations of 1932. But perhaps the most original and valuable of the three will hereafter be considered his *Studies in the Genesis of Romantic Theory in the Eighteenth Century* (1923), which sought 'to establish a new starting-point for the evolution of aesthetic studies in the eighteenth century,' showing that the theory which ultimately bore fruit in Romanticism was virtually born with Muratori and the Italian critics of his period. There remains what may yet prove to be his greatest work, a monograph upon Lessing, the fruit of a lifetime of study, which Robertson has left practically completed at his death, and which now awaits publication.

The *Modern Language Review*, as Robertson conceived it, was to be a journal 'devoted to the study of mediæval and modern literature and philology' and was to be 'worthily representative of English scholarship.' For the first four years of its existence he edited it alone, with a distinguished advisory panel, and thereafter with two coadjutors, of whom the first were Macaulay and Oelsner. From the beginning he was able to enlist the collaboration of the greatest living scholars, and among his first contributors were Skeat, H. Bradley, Bang, Gregory Smith, A. C. Bradley, Toynbee, and A. R. Waller, while Dowden, Herford and Ker were members of his Advisory Board. All these preceded Robertson in death. But happily there remain still among us, of these first collaborators, Moore Smith, for so long Robertson's co-editor, Swaen, R. W. Chambers, Boas, Greg, McKerrow, Onions, Simpson, Brandin and Pribsch. Robertson made it his policy, however, to extend the hospitality of his journal to less-known and younger men, and the record of his editorship is one of equal generosity and judiciousness.

It is a great testimony to his foresight and vision that the format of this volume is the same as that of the first. No journal, moreover, can ever have been happier in its relations with its printers and publishers, or have enjoyed more consistently admirable production. And in this, too, Robertson's personality played its part. In his relations with his co-editors his sound judgment and fair-mindedness went far to ensure the proper allocation of space to the various fields of study. And he spent his labour prodigally in every part of the duties he willingly took upon himself.

Such being the record of the *Review*, and such its policy under Robertson, it was an entirely appropriate arrangement that associated it with the Modern Humanities Research Association, under whose auspices it has appeared since 1922, and whose confidence in Robertson's management and editorship has been amply justified.

For the twenty-eight years during which Robertson served the *Review*, it was one of his most pleasing occupations, and he looked upon it with especial affection. It was characteristic of him that the quarterly *List of New Publications* was compiled solely by his own labours. It was characteristic also that, in spite of offers of help, he insisted on devoting his last days to the final editing of this number of the *Review*. It remains for those who follow him to continue on the path he indicated and to see to it that the high ideals he set up are zealously maintained.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

CHARLES J. SISSON.

AN UNPUBLISHED MANUSCRIPT BY LORD
HERBERT OF CHERBURY ENTITLED
'RELIGIO LAICI'

THE history of the manuscript of the *Religio Laici* can be traced with certainty. Originally it must have been among the papers of the sixth Lord Herbert of Cherbury. At his death in 1738 he bequeathed part of his estates to Francis Walker and part to Henry Morley. The estate of the latter at Ribbesford, near Bewdley in Worcestershire, ultimately came into the possession of Francis Ingram. According to Malone, it was in an old chest at Ribbesford that the manuscript memoirs of Lord Herbert of Cherbury lay before they were printed by Horace Walpole. It was here too that Malone discovered the *Office Book* of Sir Henry Herbert. The real estate and part of the personal estate of Francis Walker, with which evidently went another section of the Herbert papers, were left to Frederick Cornewall, son of Captain Frederick Cornewall. R.N., of Delbury Hall in Shropshire, from whose descendants the manuscripts were acquired by Messrs Quaritch, who sold them to the National Library of Wales. It is hoped to give an account of the other papers later, but on this occasion MS. 5295 E only will be considered.

The manuscript is throughout in the hand of Lord Herbert of Cherbury and contains a number of corrections made by the author. It consists of nine small folio leaves; the first bears the title on the recto and the verso is blank; the text occupies the next seven leaves and the recto of the ninth, the verso of leaf nine being blank; of the fifteen pages of text only the first eight are numbered.

While the manuscript is entitled *Religio Laici*, it is independent of the work bearing the same name, which was published in Latin in 1645. It is possible that MS. 5295 E represents a first attempt on the part of Lord Herbert to set down the ideas which were afterwards amplified and transposed into a medium suitable for communication to the learned world. It will be observed that he reduces all religions to five cardinal points of faith. These occur also in *De religione Gentilium* in a more concise form and yet again in *A Dialogue between a Tutor and his Pupil*. The *Religio Laici*, which, in view of the age when it was written, constitutes a remarkable plea for toleration and common sense in religious matters, runs thus:

RELIGIO LAICI.

Having formerly spoken of all Learning fitt to bee obtaynd in youth I shall say something of Religion, yet soe That I shall rather tell what I haue approued and followed in my owne particular then prescribe Rules to bee obserued by any els, since being a Laick I Conceiue it beyond my Function to Instruct others; And here in the first place I must ingeniously Confesse, That Nothing euer troubled mee more Then that a doctrine soe necessary as the knowledg of God and the true way to serve and worship him and the meanes to attaine euerlasting Salvation should bee soe variously deliuered and taught in diuers ages and Countreys and together vrged in such perplext and difficult Termes (as by the vast volumes of that Argument in seuerall Languages may appeare) and after all this yet to finde it presented to mee vnder such terrible menaces and Threats, as if among the many Churches extant in the world I did not adhere to y^e Right (which each said was theirs, I could not iustly hope for Salvation, Being in this doubtfull and dangerous Condition I did at last conclude that one of two things was to bee done viz^t. First That notwithstanding the Affronts and Threats with which the Priests on each side would deterre vs from all other Religions as well as Invitations promises & comfortable doctrines by which they would drawe vs to theirs in any particular Church, I was bound to study with an impartiall minde not onely all the seuerall Religions but y^e Contrauersies among them in diuers Ages Languages and Countreys, And for this purpose not onely to acquire the Tongues vsed either heretofore or at this present in the vniverse but to reade the seuerall Authors y^t haue written of these Arguments and together to conferre wth those learned men who though they had not published anything in writing might yet bee as able to edify mee as y^e former 2ly: Or els to fix vpon some fundamentall Articles agreed vpon by all that I could meete wth and Consider afterwards how farre they might Conduce to my Salvation, The Former of these two I perceiued ymmediatly to bee impossible For whose Private Affaires at home or publique duties to his native Countrey will pmitt him to take such Iourneys to all the Quarters of the world? whose Estate or meanes will furnish him with money for soe long and greate a worke? or whose Constitution is of that strength and Ability that when hee essayed all the dangers hee must meet could yet vndergoe soe immense a Trauell and Labour? whose memory Could either hold all the words of the seuerall Languages and Religions? or Iudgment decide the differences of Opinions or Faiths pretended vnder the Authority of soe many greate Churches?

which Course yet vnlesse hee pursued to y^e end he could not say hee had performed his dutye. For since the determining finally of any matter of importance where Partyes are not heard on all sides is not onely against Common reason but euen the ordinary practice of Iustice in all other Cases; he must thinke himselfe in this the most important and serious busines that can befall mankind obliged to make as particular and exact a Search and Examination of Religions as was possible, But here wee will suppose that after diligent Inquiry one might learne what was taught in this or that Countrey, vnder some generall Notions (though noe where sufficiently according to all y^e Tenents Rytes and Ceremonies taught or practised among them) yet how could the knowledge of any one Religion alone giue him satisfacion especially when hee should finde it Contrauerted in some other Countrey where as able men at least in all other Poynts of Learning might in greate numbers bee found; shall hee because his Birth or Affection inclynes him to one Countrey or Religion more then another soe factiously imbrace it as to thinke none other to bee good or acceptable to God where men doe the best they can to serue him and live well, Must hee preiudge all other Religions as erroneous and false when as yet hee hath not heard what they can alledge for the iustifying of their Faith: Howbeit because something here must bee attempted least wee should seeme wholly to forsake our selues; I did in my particular Conceive nothing soe proper for mee as to looke vpon those Countreys cheifely from whence all other learning & Sciences did originally flowe: Which Consideration as it brought mee to those Provinces in which the Greek Tongue did aunciently flourish as containing in it selfe alone almost all humane Literature, Soe when I found the Inhabitants thereof in that miserable Estate, That there was litle more then Ignorance Captiuitie and Barbarisme amongst them, I did not thinke fitt to insist there, since, howeuer there witts might bee as excellent now as in former times, they seemed to want not onely those meanes which might enable them to finde out any learned Truth but euen the heart to beleue it. Neither did their Auncient and almost vniuersally exercised Religion being Ethnique and Pagan any way affect mee there or in any Countrey els since being now intermitted and discontinued for many Ages I could not but thinke it built in greate Part vpon weake and vncertaine Principles but especially in those poynts which now are wholly antiquated and abolished. From hence therefore I cast my Eyes on Italy as the Countrey wherein not onely all the auncient Learning of the Greekes but Romans was carefully preserued and taught. But as here againe I found almost all they produced in Poynt of Religion to bee

Contrauerted among other Nations in Europ with soe much Acrimony and Earnestnesse that among the seuerall opinions or Sects the subsequent tymes haue brought forth the later for the most part hath dissented more from them then the former In soe much That the Puritan hath departed more from them then the Protestant and the Protestant then the Lutheran I could not soe safely rely vpon them as not to inquire why the Tenents of the Church of Roome were soe much deserted; But as here againe I found my selfe intangled in Contrauersies I thought fitt to make a Pause before I engaged my selfe too farre in those Tumultuous and vncharitable disputes. And the rather That I found That euen the knowledge of y^e different sects of Christian Religion alone tooke vp more tyme in the study of them then I could possibly hope to obtayne; when yet I lived beyond the ordinary Age of man; soe that whereas I thought my selfe obliged for the dischardge of my Conscience to study not onely all Religions that haue beene or are in the world, I found the Christian Religion in its diuers sects alone of greater Intricacye then that I could by any Reason or Authority dissolue or vnty the many scruples or knotts in them since sometimes flying from Reason to Faith and then from Faith againe to Reason wth a singular Agility in both I found my selfe vnable to follow them in any one certaine way I Confesse that if they had adhered singly to either of these two nothing could haue scandalized mee; Since that w^{ch} was delivered vpon Reason I should haue examined & finally accepted vpon the same Ground, And aswell should I haue beleived those Poynts of Faith which were deliuered mee upon the reuerend Authority of y^e Church especially when It could haue beene proued that any former Church or Congregation had vnder their hands and seales or in any other Authentique manner subscribed as Eye witnesses to that they Consigned vnto Posterity and not as hearers onely; It being of greate moment in the Affirmation of things past to sett downe what they know certainly and to come afterwards to what was tould them by others which they againe had from others and soe perchance for many descents especially if such things were related as neither they from whome they heard it nor indeed any mortall man by naturall meanes could knowe Neither would it bee sufficient to say That their knowledge was supernaturall or divine since as that is more then could bee knowne in following tymes; Soe when it were graunted it should inferre litle to mee but that which I would beleieve wthout it; For if any vnder the name of a Seer should byd mee doe a sinne or bee impenitent I should not beleieve him though he pretended a thousand Reuelations for it On the other side, if hee byd mee bee vertuous and penitent though hee had not soe much as a

piece of a Reuelation for it, I should give entire credit to him, That therefore the Certainty of that doctrine which is called revealed or the word of God in any Age or Countrey comes not to mee symply either from the Authority of him that sayd The holy spirit did dictate the words or Reuelations noe nor from the Authority of them that beleiued it how many and greate soeuer but from the Goodnes of y^e doctrine it selfe without which I should beleiue but litle in any extraordinary kynde. Euery man in what Countrey or Age soeuer that teacheth Goodnes speakes the word of God to mee. If the Contrary hee shall neuer make mee beleiue That either hee knoweth God or heard him speake soe much as one sillable much lesse that hee is soe familiar wth God as to know him by his voice. I doe not deny yet but revelations may bee made to men either sleeping or waking but where I conceiue earnest prayers haue been made before hand and some publike and miraculous Confirmation of y^e thing revealed hath followed Howsoeuer vnlesse the thing in it selfe be right good and honest I should not conceiue it was God that spake But some evill spirit that would seduce and deceiue mee, It having pleased God soe to implant the love of Goodnes & Truth in the Soule that hee hath made them a part of Co^mon Reason and Conspicuous by there owne Light from which therefore if wee recede wee shall finde our selues Cast not onely into much Error and darknes but euen in the Court of our owne Consciences Criminall and Condemned, For which Cause also I beleiue God is soe sparing in making publike Revelations, for if men did wholly trust to them they would certainly neglect there proper dutyes, And thus much for publike Reuelac^ons. Now if Any man should say a particular Revelation came to him I should beleiue him as farre as it was fitt to Credit a single wittnes in soe Rare a Case, but certaynly I should not depart from my Comon reason whatsoeuer hee should pretend to Touch vpon these Grounds. And from single wittnesses and noe more things comonly averred in all Religions are originally deriued, Soe that if one did resolute and vnfold the wholle Contexture of there miraculous narrations from Age to Age euen to y^e longest space of tyme wee shall finde for the most part the first Credit or Authority of the said Narration did depend vpon the bare Allegation of some on singular person and noe more or if more persons then one did Concurr yet as long as they haue not demonstrated to Posterity That the Reuelation they receiued must necessarily come from the supreme God and none els, I shall esteeme all that they said for litle more then a single Testemoney whereby it appeareth That though Faith or Assent to things deliuered bee invested in the mindes of huge multitudes of Persons yet the Primitive Truth is

referred most comonly to some one person or not many more, When therefore any strange or miraculous history is deliuered to Posterity through the Conveyance of others, It will bee requisite to Consider whether they that seeme to giue Credit there vnto doe not acquire much Authority and procure many Advantages to themselues from thence, The Nature of men being for the most part prone allwayes to entertaine such beleifes as turne to theire Benefitte, Furthermore in my opinion it is to bee obserued That as it is not safe absolutely to trust to any single or weake Testemony in matters of greate Consequence Soe it will bee much more dangerous to frame new doctrines or Conclusions out of them for directing of our selues in the wholle Course of our Life; Since Error thus may bee multiplyed almost infinitely; These Considerations therefore brought mee at last to bee more sparing in the beleife of miraculous narracōns and especially for building any new doctrines vpon them since Impostors such as Iannes and Iambres¹ haue bene said to doe miracles whose Egyptian doctrine yet I should neuer beleue I might say something also of Apolonius Tyaneus and Simon Magus who howsoever they may bee beleued to haue done Miracles did not Teach any vniversall doctrine yet, to which Assent was given, That therefore It is noe good Argument to say, such a man did miracles therefore I beleue all hee saith since these things seeme miracles to fooles and Children which are not soe to wise men, Besides things may bee done by naturall meanes which some men may thinke miraculous, And finally by Confederacy one helping another to deceiue and abuse the people; In which kynde examples haue bene frequent among Preists in former Ages (as by the many discoveryes of them may appeare. And as litle did many of theire Prophecyes drawe mee to any new Religion, Since one shall hardly meete wth a Prophecye deliuered soe clearely & prospicuously as to marke out and distinguish from all others any Person or Event in subsequent tymes. For my part I could neuer esteeme yet any thing to bee an vndoubted Prophecy which in y^e first place was not like a Picture It being not enough to describe or poynt one member or part of the Face or body vnlesse the Symetry or Parts were together represented wth the outward Stature Colour and Fashion Soe likewise It will bee necessary for the Representing his Actions to future tymes the Prophecy should bee like a History, In which It is required The Tyme Place and manner of all his Actions should bee set downe soe particularly as to distinguish him from all others, That therefore many of the doubtfull and obscure Predictions

¹ In 2 *Timothy*, ch. iii, v. 8, it is said that Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses. Presumably they were among the magicians of Egypt mentioned in *Exodus*, ch. vii, v. 11.

which haue beene attributed to diuers who from thence haue acquired the names of Prophetts seeme to bee litle more then bould Coniectures which might in some Tyme or other Take Effect there being nothing I will not Say likely or possible but euen vnlikely and onely not impossible That in some time or place or manner will not haue its Effect and full-filling; That therefore if any man hath vndertaken heretofore or shall yet in this Age vndertake to Prophecy vpon what vayne ground soeuer, yet if hee gett that Credit among future Ages as to bee thought a Prophet hee will finde those that shall apply his words to some Action or Event That did or will follow in all likelihood which motiues made mee as doubtfull off their Prophecyes as of such miracles and Reuelations I formerly mentioned, Neuertheles If any shall think that prophecyes may bee made vpon more easy Termes I shall not Argue to y^e Contrary but shall onely wish That hee doe not deceiue himselfe howsoeuer when Prophecyes were graunted I Should not recede from my Comon Reason to build new doctrines vpon them especially when there is noe originall Attestacōn that the Prophecy was consigned vnto vs in those very words in which they are now extant and for the rest That they are more obscure then that an vnquestionable Certainty may bee built vpon them but herein I am Content to let euery man vse his owne Iudgement, All which Poynts having bin for a long time debated and examined by mee to the best of my vnderstanding I did thinke fitt the rather to study and looke out those Comon principles of Religion I could meete wth any where; Onely before I vndertooke this greate Taske I thought it not amisse to aduise vpon what Grounds the Contrauerted Poynts amongst them did move, But as here I obserued nothing but matter of Faith or beleife questioned in any Age or Countrey I did the more easily passe by it to come to those Articles which were grounded not onely vpon Reason and vniuersall Consent of Religions but are (I beleiue) extant and operative in the hearts of all men who are not prepossessed and obstructed wth Erronious doctrines and I am sure most deeply ingraued in myne which being done I thought it my part to inquire whether by an Apt Connection of the parts thereof I might fix soe solid a Foundation as I might repose thereon as the first ground of Relligious Worship. The Articles which I haue found after a long & tedious Scruteny are five onely, which I am Confident are soe Catholique or vniuersall That all the Religions that euer were are or I beleiue shall bee did doe and will embrace them.

1. That though diuers deities Godheads or diuine Natures, were celebrated or worshipped in seuerall Ages or Countreys throughout the wholle world, yet that there is noe agreement or Consent but onely con-

cerning one supreme God whome all men did and doe Acknowledge vnder the Attributes of Optimus Maximus which also are such as doe Contayne virtually in them all that is vsually sayd of the supreme God, The one supposing his Providence the other his Power in y^e highest degree and extention and both these together inferring his Wisdome Iustice mercy and the rest.

2. That though diuers other dertyes Godheads or divine natures haue beene celebrated or worshipped more or lesse in some inferior or subordinate kynde, yet that there is noe vniuersall Agreement or Consent concerning the worship of any other then the Supreme God in whome Authors generally say all other Godheads or divine natures are worshipped.

3. That though diuers Rytes Misteryes and Sacra (as the Romans Call them) were introduced to y^e worship of the Supreme God yet that there is noe vniuersall Consent or Agreement conñing them, But that a Pure and vntaynted minde as being Conscious in it selfe of noe vnworthynesse, a Vertuous and a pious life testified by the Expressions of Goodnes and Charity to all and accompanied with love Faith and hope in God were vndoubted wayes of serving him.

4. That though Sacrifices for abolishing of Sinnes of more then one sorte as also Expiations Lustrations and diuers other Rytes invented by the Sacerdotall order were vsed for the purging of man from Sinne yet there was noe vniuersall Consent or Agreement Concerning them But that Repentance is a certayne Signe of Gods Spirit working in vs and y^e onely remedy for Sinne that is declared publiquely to all mankind and the most rationall way to returne to God and Vertue is by vniuersall Consent and agreement established euery where without soe much as the least Contradiction, Not yet that I would say all men acknowledg Gods Iustice can bee satisfyed by meere repentance and returning to a good Life and therefore that a further satisfaction or reparation for the offences against the divine Ma^{tie} is required; yet as there is noe vniuersall Consent or Agreement concerning the meanes how this is effected it being indeede of a deeper Scrutiny then mans reason can Reach vnto I shall passe by in this my generall discourse of Religion; and the rather that in the most Authentique doctrine concerning this poynt many doe not see why according to the ordinary Rules of Iustice God should punish one for the Sinnes of another when yet hee would voluntarily vndergoe the Punishment, Howbeit these Considerations following haue been thought not impertinent for the directing of vs in this difficult poynt. 1. That hee who iudgeth man is his Father and doth looke on him as a fraile Creature

and obnoxious to Sinne. 2. That he generally findes men sinne rather out of this Frailty then out of any desire to offend his divine Ma^{tie}. 3. That if man had beene made inwardly prone to sinne and yet destitute of all inward meanes to returne to him againe hee had beene not onely remediles in himselfe but more miserable then that it Could be supposed an infinite goodnes did at first Create & doth still perpetuate humane kynde. 4. That man can doe noe more on his part for the satisfying of divine Iustice then bee heartily sorry and repent him of his sinne and together endeavor through his Grace to returne to y^e Right way from which through his Transgressions hee had erred; Or if this did not suffice for the making of his Peace, The supreme God by inflicting some temporall punishment, in this life might satisfy his owne Iustice, 5. That if Temporall Punishment in this life were too htle for the Sinne Committed hee might inflict a greater Punishment hereafter in the other life without giving yet eternall damnation to those who if not for the love of goodnes yet at least vpon sense of theire Punishment would not sinne eternally. Howbeit as these things againe were Contrauerted I was Constrayned to insist vpon this single Proposition onely; vniuersally acknowledged; That Repentance is the onely knowne and publike meanes which on our part is required for satisfying the divine Iustice and returning to y^e right way of serving God,

5. That though Concer[n]ing¹ the Place Quantity Quality manner or duration of Reward or Punishment after this Life there bee noe vniuersall Agreement or Consent yet that the soules of pious vertuous and good men enioy a better state after this Life and vitious & wicked men a worse is vniuersally acknowledged by all Religions not the Indians excepted, It being Congruous to Reason and the Notions wee haue of the divine Iustice that good men but especially those who were afflicted in this Life should receiue theire Reward hereafter, as well as that wicked men who are happy here should haue in the next world Condigne Punishm^t, which I say because there is noe other vniuersall Rule whereby to guide our beleife Concerning Gods Iustice hereafter but that his Punishment is proportioned to y^e Offence;

When I had assembled these fiue Poynts² and Articles and ordered them thus, I must Confesse I did receiue an infinite Ioy and Contentment in my selfe both that I found the vniuersall Prouidence of God had pro-

¹ MS. Concerning

² In *De religione Gentilium* the five points appear as follows: 'I. Esse Deum summum, II. Coli debere, III. Virtutem, Pietatemque esse præcipuas partes Cultus divini, IV. Dolendum esse ob peccata, abisque respiscendum, V. Dari ex Bonitate Iustitiaque divina præmium vel poena, tum in hac vita, tum post hanc vitam.'

ceeded thus farre in giving meanes for Saluation to all mankynde and therein declared himselfe to bee Pater communis, as also that I could not tell how to imagine soe much as one Article more in Comon Reason that could make man better or more pious when the abouesaid five Articles were rightly explicated. I did indeede perceiue diuers Poynts added herevnto which gaue much ease and Relaxation to mens mindes, while they were taught to trust cheifely to y^e meritts and satisfaction of others for the obtayning of their euerlasting happines, Soe that although the doctrine of good works and Repentance were together Connected and inculcated seriously into mens mindes, yet it may bee found that they doe not vsually soe much fix themselues there as on the aforesaid Satisfaction; while they said all their works were Corrupt and abominable and that they could not of themselues soe much as thinke one good thought noe nor that neither and consequently pretended to heauen out of a Faith and Beleife that this busines is done to their hands rather then out of those works they seemed soe much to disclayme; I did in others finde a Doctrine concerning Predestination soe taught That men did cheifely Trust to Gods eternall Election of them before all worlds; For as they sayd There was a certayne damned Masse from which God out of his good pleasure Chose some and reprobated others I Noted those men were rather Inquisitive through the help of their Teachers whether they were of the number of the Ellect then studious to worke out their Salvation by the good degrees abouerelated Soe that although their Teachers did indeed exhort them to a good life and Repentance noe lesse then the Former yet as men deriued not the next Causes of their Salvation from their owne good Endeavors or Actions soe much as from those secret Counsellis of God they comonly intermitted much off their proper duties as beleiving either they could not fall greivously or at least that such remedies are provided for them as they should not finally perish In soe much as one may obserue that Vertue hath suffered noe litle detriment hereby. All which I say not yet as if I would haue men conceiue they could by their good works meritt any thing of God (as thinking this doctrine of meritts euer to bee absurd) But that I hope men may assure themselues that when really they doe y^e best they can It were better to Trust that God (through his infinite mercy) would accept of those good workes ioyned with Faith in and Love of God then to drawe conclusions of the certaynty of their Salvation from those secret and hidden Counsellis of God which noe Power of man can reach vnto.

Againe I found others who though they doe not say they could tell who were predestinated but in stead thereof recomended good works as the

most effectuall meanes on our Parts for coming to God did yet otherwise teach diuers things, which being not yet rightly vnderstood derogated not a litle from the seuerity of Vertue, For as they said they had Power to remitt sinnes and this Remission againe was graunted vpon noe very difficult Termes men did not feare to returne to sinne againe when they found Pardon soe Easy, which abuse as also some of those abouementioned I conceue rather to proceede from y^e Pronenesse of men to sinne then from the doctrine of their Preists or Teachers. I could enlarge my selfe much vpon this Argument but that I am vnwilling to transgresse my bounds especially since I beleieue my selfe sufficiently vnderstood. Besides I finde I cannot speake more of those seuerall doctrines vnlesse I should enter into Contrauersies which (as a Laike) I can neuer sufficiently resoluē! Howbeit I hope I may soe farre expresse my selfe as to wish all those Poynts on what syde soeuer may bee warily taught and on such Termes That vpon what promis or Comfortable doctrine soeuer presented to mankind nothing may bee detracted from that Vertue and goodnes which ought to bee the Perpetuall Exercise of our Life, lest occasion bee giuen to make men more ready and bould to sinne againe, Since while men attend cheifely to those outward helps or Remedyes, they vsually Comply not soe entirely wth their proper duties,

These five Articles being thus declared which if men did embrace alone would Assert a Catholique Church, and it being together shewed how necessary it is for euery man to begin these before hee descend to the wholle Context or Bulke of any one Religion which hee may finde Contrauerted in diuers ages and Countreys, I shall now deliuer the Reasons for which I principally embraced them,

1. First That there is noe other open and manifest way extant to Mankynde whereby it is possible to establish Gods vniuersall Prouidence w^{ch} yet is his highest Attribute,

2. That I found nothing can bee added vnto them which will make a man really more vertuous and good when the aforesaid fiue poynts are sufficiently taught according to all their parts,

3. That though the doctrines added therevnto bee indeed Comfortable and full of Promis to those who beleieue them yet that they were more Contrauerted then y^t the Age of any man could vnty and dissoluē the Knotts and Intricacies in them, or indeed soe much as read the seuerall Authors which had written concerning that Argument, wthout which yet hee could not say hee had heard all Partyes or was able to forme a perfect Iudgment vpon them,

4. That I found all Misteryes Sacraments and Reuelations cheifely

tended to y^e Establishment of these five Articles as being at least y^e principall end for which they were ordeyned,

5. That I thought that the doing of some good deede speaking some good word, or thinking some good thought were more necessary Exercises of my Life then that I should intermitt them for any Consideration whatsoever: Having thus settled these five Poynts as fundamentall & together demonstrated That wee ought to giue them the first Place in our Religion I shall come to y^t supplementall part comonly called Faith which word as I found among Authors to bee vsed in two diuers Senses I shall thinke fitt here to distinguish: First as it is vnderstood to bee a firme Assent giuen to things past vpon the Credit and Authority of others, Secondly as it is taken for a faculty of the Soule laying hould and fixing it selfe on Gods providence and goodnes for obtayning a better life through his mercy hereafter if wee doe the best wee can where I must obserue That as the first hath its next or most ymmediat Testemony from man and Consequently is true or false as they who first affirmed it were, Soe the second is held by all Churches necessary to bee vsed as the best meanes for vniting our Soules wth God when true Piety & a good life doe concurre In soe much That I am confident That this faith may bee found in good men though noe Tradition concerning former tymes euer came to their Notice whereas the other Faith depending cheifely on Revelations Miracles and Prophecyes hath in it many difficultyes as I haue said before, and is not onely Contrauerted among the Strickter Professors of it but in a sort reiected by those Nations among whome other Faiths haue beene taught by their Lawegivers, Notwithstanding all which as I thought it Concerned mee among these seuerall and miraculous Traditions which were not impossible to haue beene done (if God soe pleased) not to distrust and doubt of all, I bent my selfe cheifely to the Christian Faith contayned in the holy Bible as having in it more exact precepts for teaching vs a good life and repentance then any other booke whatsoever that I could meete with; Besides I found my selfe through Gods Providence borne in that Church and Instructed euen from my Infancy in the holy doctrine drawne from thence But as together I obserued many things taught in the sayd Church which were not onely vehemently opposed by other Christian Churches but repudiated in their Cheife parts among other Nations, I found noe such solid foundation to build this my Faith vpon as the Authority in generall of the Christian Church resolving according to the saying of a learned Father That those things I neuer had knowne without the Church I had neuer beleived without it, Neither did the Controuersies among them much move mee since being a meere

Laick I had neither will nor leasure to engage my selfe in the clearing of these doubts for the studying of which alone my wholle life did not suffice when yet I had attended nothing els: The Scruples of these variously agitated disputes by men equally learned being of such Intimacy That I sawe more and more might bee sayd about them Then that I could presume to determine any thing sufficiently by the Iudgment of the best Authors I did peruse on any side, Soe that for my finall Resolution I thought the best grounds of my faith were to bee taken from those poynts w^{ch} were piously assented vnto by all Christians and might aptly Consubstist with the five Catholicke Articles, And for the disputes and Controuersies of learned men to lay them aside vntill they were agreed among themselues and in the meane tyme to attend a good life and repentance Assuring my self That in the Quality of a Laike and Secular person my Time was better imployd soe then in the inexplicable subtilities of the schooles, To conclude I embraced the five Articles for the reasons abouementioned from whence coming to the Doctrines of Faith I beleied piously vpon the reuerend Authority of the Church that which was vnanimously taught by them and did not imply Contradictions, All which I haue here set downe wthout intention to scandalize any but to gue a reason not onely of those poynts which may bee knowne but beleied in the Christian Religion and together to induce men from these principles to the practise of a good life & a blessed Concord among themselues since having ioyntly receiued these five Catholike points there will bee lesse occasion of hate and dissention about the rest, Soe that the different opinion amongst them might bee argued wth lesse violence and passion The Poynts wherein they agreed being greater Bonds of Love and Amity among them then that they should bee dissolved on any lesser occasion: And certainly vnlesse the method I haue here proposed bee effectuall to this purpose I see noe hope that any good Reconciliation can follow among the Principle Sects of y^e Christian Religion, since the one affirming y^e Scripture is the Sole Iudge of Controuersies and the other saying the Church alone should determine them they seeme like Persons in Variance which being not agreed concerning there Arbiters or Iudges cannot hope the Busines in Question betwixt them will finde an equall and indifferent decision¹.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

¹ I wish gratefully to acknowledge the courtesy of Mr W. Ll. Davies, librarian of the National Library of Wales, and of his staff.

THE ALLEGED FALSEHOODS IN MILTON'S ACCOUNT OF HIS CONTINENTAL TOUR

THERE are certain apparent inconsistencies in Milton's account in the *Defensio Secunda* of his continental tour which raise the question not merely of the accuracy of that narrative but of Milton's honesty: unless they can be explained they must be regarded as deliberate falsehoods. Professor Liljegren¹, who does so regard them, has set them forth clearly and drawn the consequences, using them effectively as evidence for his thesis that Milton was in the habit of inventing or glossing the facts of his personal history in order to acquire merit and give himself a good character with his public². Scholars shy at this interpretation, but none, so far as I know, has refuted the evidence and it has therefore necessarily influenced their opinion of Milton and the trustworthiness of his word; this passage of the *Defensio Secunda*, together with that other where Milton attributes his earlier pamphlets to his passion for liberty, has given rise to a lingering suspicion that Milton at least idealised the story of his life, however innocently. Thus Professor Hanford defensively writes, 'The general credibility of this and other utterances about himself cannot be questioned. If, looking back upon his actions from a later period, he puts his motives in the most ideal light, it is because he actually so interpreted them, and who shall determine the exact degree to which, in any particular instance, he deceived himself?' This fairly represents the attitude, defensive and slightly apologetic, of cautious scholars sympathetic to Milton. And yet there is a clear issue to be decided one way or the other. It is useless to talk of the general credibility of Milton's statements: Milton is either a credible witness or he is not. The issue turns on whether he can be shown in any one instance to have misrepresented the *facts*, the known circumstances of the case: if so, we can never be sure that he is telling the truth about his *motives*, to which he is the sole witness; but if not, there is no ground whatever for questioning this latter kind of statement. He alone knew the history of his mind, what he had thought and felt and acted upon; we can only scrutinise the circumstances. Now Milton has already been justified in one of the two passages where his story seemed to disagree with the

¹ *Milton and Galileo in Studies in Milton* (Lund, 1918).

² Professor Liljegren's main argument, that Milton never visited Galileo (as he claims to have done in the *Areopagitica*), rests on this and other less cogent evidence of Milton's habitual lying.

³ *A Milton Handbook* (1928), p. 3.

circumstances: the charge of giving a false account of the writing of the earlier pamphlets has been shown to rest on ignorance of the true facts¹. My present purpose is to dispose of the other incriminating passage by verifying the matters of fact on which Milton has been given the lie.

I shall first give the substance of Milton's narrative in an English translation, inserting known or probable dates; but those sentences that are crucial to our discussion will be quoted in the original Latin²:

Exacto in hunc modum quinquennio (sc. his studies at Horton), post matris obitum (April 3, 1637), regiones exteras, et Italiam potissimum, videndi cupidus, exorato patre, uno cum famulo profectus sum. On my departure the celebrated Henry Wotton honoured me with a most friendly letter (April 13, 1638). The noble Thomas Scudamore, King Charles's ambassador, received me most courteously at Paris and gave me an introduction to the learned Hugo Grotius, at that time ambassador from the Queen of Sweden to the French court; when I left for Italy a few days later he gave me letters to English merchants on my route. Taking ship at Nice I reached Genoa, and afterwards visited Leghorn, Pisa and Florence; in the latter city I stayed about two months (August-September, 1638)³. From Florence I went to Siena and thence to Rome, where I stayed another two months (October-November)⁴. I then went to Naples, where Manso paid me the most friendly attentions, showing me the sights of the city and taking me to the palace of the viceroy and more than once coming to see me at my lodgings. *In Siciliam quoque et Graeciam trajicere volentem me, tristis ex Anglia belli civilis nuntius revocavit: Turpe enim existimabam, dum mei cives domi de libertate dimicarent, me animi causa otiose peregrinari* (December, 1638). As I was preparing to return to Rome some merchants warned me that they had received intelligence of the English Jesuits there having formed a plot against me if I returned, because I had spoken too freely on religious matters; for I had made it a rule never to start a conversation on religion in any of these parts but, if questioned about my faith, to dissemble nothing, whatever I might suffer. Nevertheless I returned to Rome; what I was I concealed from no one who asked, and for about another two months, as before, I openly defended the orthodox religion in the very city of the Pope, if any one attacked it (January-February, 1639).

¹ See Hanford's *Chronology of Milton's Private Studies* and my *Milton's First Marriage* (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, October, 1931).

² Toland's edition (1698), III, p. 96.

³ *Epist. Fam.* 8, written at Florence September 10. Attended meeting of Svogliati September 16 (Masson's *Life*, I, p. 782).

⁴ Guest of English Jesuit College October 30 (*Commonplace Book*, Camden Soc., p. xvi).

By the grace of God I got back safe to Florence where I stayed as many months as before (March-April)¹, making an excursion for a few days to Lucca. Then crossing the Apennines, I went by Bologna and Ferrara to Venice, where I spent a month (May); thence through Verona and Milan, over the Pennine Alps, to Geneva, where I talked daily with John Deodati (June)². *Deinde eodem itinere, quo prius, per Galliam, post annum et tres plus minus menses in patriam revertor* (July-August, 1639); *eodem ferme tempore quo Carolus cum Scotis, rupta pace, bellum alterum quod vocant Episcopale, redintegrabat; in quo fuis primo congressu regis copis* (August, 1640), *cum videret etiam omnes Anglos, et merito quidem, in se pessime animatos, malo coactus, non sponte, Parlamentum haud ita multo post, convocavit* (September 24, 1640)³.

There are three matters of fact in this story which have been cited as false and which certainly require explaining⁴. First, the reason given for turning back at Naples in December appears to refer to the outbreak of the First Bishops' War, which only occurred in the following March; secondly, the urgency of this reason for returning is contradicted by the fact that Milton returned home as leisurely as he went out; thirdly, he arrived back in England not, as he seems to assert, when the Second Bishops' War was beginning, but a whole year earlier. These discrepancies follow from the usual interpretation of the passages in question. So interpreted, the statements are false and Milton would have known them to be false; they cannot be set down to a bad or an idealising memory. In that case we have no option but to agree with Professor Liljegren that Milton fudged the chronology of his tour in order to pose as a patriot and to pander to his sense of his own importance.

That is the indictment. The first significant point about it is that it ignores another similar inaccuracy in the very opening sentence of Milton's narrative. He says he set out after his mother's death when in fact he set out a year later. This inaccuracy contradicts the others and makes it difficult to believe that Milton had it in mind to deceive the reader by post-dating his tour; taken precisely, as the other statements have been taken, it would mean that he arrived back in England nine months before the First Bishops' War began. Clearly it was not meant to be taken precisely; but then it becomes an example, luckily beyond

¹ *Epist. Fam.* 9, written at Florence March 30. Attended meetings of Svoghati March 17, 24, 31 (Masson, I, pp. 821-2).

² Entry in album of Camillo Cerdogni, June 10.

³ Gardner, ix, p. 208: the Long Parliament actually assembled November 3, 1640.

⁴ Professor Liljegren's objection, that if the Jesuits had been so hot on Milton's tracks he could not have spent two months in Rome, is problematical and therefore outside the discussion.

suspicion, of the way Milton groups events together in summarising the main points in his story, and as such helps to clear up the last of our three discrepancies. The death of his mother is remembered as a landmark in his life, after which he began to think of going abroad; similarly he marks his return to England by a crisis in national affairs which extended over the next fifteen months, culminating in the defeat of the King and the meeting of the Long Parliament. How well this explanation fits the case will appear more clearly when we have followed the course of events to which Milton refers.

Another point that strikes one about these alleged misstatements is that if Milton intended to deceive he was not only a careless liar, as shown by the opening sentence, but an uncommonly stupid one; for the chronology of the tour can be worked out pretty well from his own narrative and he is thus refuted out of his own mouth. Indeed the second of the supposed inconsistencies may for this reason be dismissed as too preposterous. Had Milton wished, as the indictment presumes, to convey the impression that he hurried home post-haste to take his part in the war, would he have described that leisurely return? All he can be taken to imply is that he did not feel free in the circumstances to travel farther afield, spending another six or twelve months exploring Sicily and Greece; having turned reluctantly homewards he felt under no obligation to curtail what was left of his projected tour. Surely we can accept this as a candid account.

The two points really requiring to be explained then are the references to the Bishops' Wars. First, what news from England of civil war—*tristis ex Anglia belli civilis nuntius*—could have reached Milton in Naples at the end of the year 1638? Professor Liljegren begs this primary question by speaking of the 'sudden outbreak' of war in the following March; than which nothing could be further from the truth. The Scottish trouble, which ended in the Bishops' Wars, was brewing long before Milton left England; by the summer of 1638 preparations for war were on foot in England and Scotland; by the autumn everyone in both countries knew war to be inevitable. It was this news of the impending war, not of the commencement of hostilities, that turned Milton back. In order to establish this interpretation it is only necessary to follow the course of the quarrel between Charles and Scotland.

The trouble arose from the attempt of Charles I and Laud to enforce the episcopal system first imposed on the Scottish church by James, and to bring Scotland into ecclesiastical conformity with England¹. The first

¹ For the general account of events, see Gardiner's *History*, VIII, chaps. lxxxv–vi.

incident in the struggle was the riot at St Giles', Edinburgh, July 23, 1637, when the new Prayer Book was introduced; there were similar riots on September 25 and October 18. This popular resistance was quickly organised: by the end of February, 1638, a national Covenant had been drawn up pledging the people to defend the reformed religion against popish innovations, and by April the Covenant had been subscribed by the majority of the Scottish nation. The English puritans were naturally in sympathy with their Scottish brethren; and we know from *Lycidas* what Milton must have thought of these events. Moreover, the general dissatisfaction in England with the King's attempt at personal government, and more particularly the grievance over ship-money, inclined others than puritans to a sympathetic interest with the Scots¹.

When Milton left England, then, the country was intent on the Scottish business; events were already in train that led to the civil war; and he would not be unprepared for the news that reached him at Naples of the progress of affairs, nor at a loss to read them aright. By June, 1638, both sides had begun to prepare for war². On July 1 the King told his Council that 'he had given orders to provide arms and ammunition to fortify three towns upon the borders³.' From early in August the roads between England and Scotland were stopped and letters were intercepted⁴. At the same time two ships were sent to intercept supplies of arms about to be conveyed from the Low Countries to Scotland⁵. The Council of War on September 10 gave orders for arms for 12,000 foot and 400 horse to be sent North, for the Bishop of Durham to muster his trained men, for the trained bands of Yorkshire to be mustered, and for munitions to be collected at Hull. Sir Thomas Dymoke, writing to Secretary Windebank on September 26, conceives the army of the North to be in such forwardness that few places are undisposed of. On October 20 a memorandum was made of arrangements for the transport of troops from Ireland to Scotland⁶.

The reports in the *Calendar of State Papers* of seditious speeches in England during the summer of 1638 show that these proceedings were not secret from the public, and also show in what light they were regarded. On July 4 John Alured is reported to have said that the Scots would invade England and reform it by a Parliament as they have their own; the King would get no one to fight against them, for the English were their own blood. On July 11 Christopher Hatton of Northampton-

¹ *Cal. S. P. Dom.*, 12, p. ix.

² *Cal. S. P. Dom.*, 12, p. xii.

⁵ *Ibid.* August 11, 13.

² Gardiner, VIII, pp. 344-5.

⁴ *Ibid.* under August 10.

⁶ *Ibid.* under given dates.

shire is reported to have said that 'ship-money here in England would cause the like stirs that were now in Scotland before it were long.' On August 8 Captain Napier, a Scot in London, is accused of saying that 40,000 English are to bring in the Scottish army, of speaking against the revenue of the clergy and their meddling with state affairs, and of stating that we are to have a Parliament here as well as in Scotland. On September 30 the high-constable of Wymersley, Northants, was accused of similar seditious remarks, and of stating that the King was under a law as well as his subjects. On August 24 Sir John Manwood informs Sir John Pennington that two gentlemen from Holland report arms and ammunition embarked at Amsterdam for Scotland: 'they talk broad of a difference between England and Scotland.'

By October the Scottish leaders were convinced that the King intended war whether his terms were accepted or not, and they cast down the gauntlet by citing the Scottish bishops to appear before the Assembly on various charges. The Assembly met at Glasgow on November 21 and proceeded to repudiate all its previous acts and all acts of Parliament affecting ecclesiastical affairs since the accession of James VI. On November 28 Hamilton, the King's Commissioner, declared the Assembly dissolved, but it continued to sit and to pass resolutions; Ranke compares this defiance of the King 'with the first steps by which, a century and a half later, the newly-created French National Assembly for the first time withstood the demands of the King.' War was now inevitable. On December 8 the acts of the Assembly were annulled by the King, and the same day a royal proclamation was sent to the Lords-Lieutenant of the Northern counties to make their preparations in accordance with instructions lately given.

It is clear from all this that the First Bishops' War was not a 'sudden outbreak'; that by the autumn it was generally recognised as inevitable, and recognised as civil war. And it is clear that this news could have reached Milton at Naples by the end of the year and caused him to sacrifice his Grecian tour.

We can deal more briefly with the other statement, that he arrived back in England about the time Charles was renewing the Bishops' War: 'eodem ferme tempore quo Carolus cum Scotis, rupta pace, bellum alterum quod vocant Episcopale, redintegrabat.' The key phrase here is 'rupta pace,' which refers to the treaty with which the first war was quickly concluded on June 18, 1639. This treaty was variously called the *Pacification of Berwick* or of *Birks*, or more often simply the *Pacification*; and it broke down almost as soon as it was made. Being chiefly in

conversation, as Clarendon remarks, it was open to various interpretations, and each side at once began to complain of the other's having broken the terms. Hamilton, returning from Scotland on July 6, told the King that a fresh war was inevitable; he put the question whether the King could obtain money for a war without the aid of Parliament, and if not whether he was willing to summon one¹. When Charles returned to London on August 3 he found that a report had been published by the Scottish leaders of the conversations at Berwick, and he ordered it to be burnt by the common hangman. That was the end of the *Pacification*. On August 12 the Assembly met at Edinburgh, and on August 17 abolished episcopacy as previously at Glasgow. On September 22 Wentworth arrived in London and from that time became the King's chief adviser; his single-minded advice was to renew the war and to crush the rebels by force of arms.

Clearly this is the state of affairs Milton refers to as existing about the time of his return: the King, having broken the Peace, was preparing to renew the war. Milton then goes on to summarise the group of dependent events—the scattering of the royal forces at the first onset and the consequent summoning of Parliament.

Granted that a satisfactory explanation has now been given of this whole passage in the *Defensio Secunda*, the last material evidence of Milton's mendacity is gone. It is no longer necessary to plead the *general* credibility of his autobiographical statements; what he tells us about himself and his motives may be accepted without apology as true. We are permitted once more to believe, for instance, his account of what he thought and felt and did in Italy, however meritorious or heroic even. A liar of course he may have been, but not yet a convicted one.

B. A. WRIGHT.

GLASGOW.

¹ Ranke, *Hist. of England*, II, p. 171; from Burnet, *Dukes of Hamilton*.

THE SUFFIX OF APPURTENANCE IN 'WIDSITH'

THE ancient Germans in their name-giving made use, among other suffixes, of a so-called suffix of appurtenance, which consisted, in its full grade, of one of the vowels *i*, *u*, *a* (from I.E. *e/o*) followed by the dental spirant (from I.E. *t*). This spirant might be either the voiceless *þ*, or, with Vernerian change, the voiced *ð*. The vowel of the suffix might also be wanting (the so-called *nl*-grade). The names formed with the suffix of appurtenance properly belonged to the consonant stems, but early showed a tendency to go over to other declensions. Of recent discussions of the suffix, that of H. Lindroth (*Namn och Bygd*, VI, pp. 65 ff.) is the most thorough-going, although some of Lindroth's observations must be considered out of date, the subsequent papers of A. Noreen (*Fornvannen*, xv, pp. 23 ff.) and L. Weibull (*Ark nord. Fil.*, xli, p. 233) having served to clarify more than one point which Lindroth still felt to be doubtful. Thus, we now know pretty definitely that O.N. *Egðir* meant the inhabitants of the district *Agi* or *Agand*, and that the *Liuthida* of Jordanes (*Getica*, III) were the inhabitants of the district *Liuthgud* (now *Luggude*) in Skåne. It is worthy of special note that in the formation of these tribal names the suffix *-and* and the second element *-gud* of the regional names were discarded. We shall see that this peculiarity is highly characteristic of formations with the suffix of appurtenance.

Five tribal names in the Old English poem *Widsith* show the suffix under discussion. I will take these names up in alphabetical order.

I.

60 Mid *Gefþum* ic wæs...

Here the tribal name occurs as *Gefþum* (dat. pl.). The same name appears in *Beowulf*, 2494, in the form *Gifðum* (dat. pl.). The tribe referred to is familiar from classical and post-classical sources, where its name appears in a variety of forms. In listing these, I follow, with adaptations, the classification of Schönfeld:

| | | | |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 1a. Gipedae | 2a. Gīpidae | 3a. Gepidae | 4a. — |
| Gīpedes | Gīpides | — | Γῆπαιδες |
| Gīppedi | Gīppidos | Gepidi, Gepidas | — |
| 1b. — | 2b. — | 3b. Gebidae | 4b. — |
| — | Gibites | — | — |
| Gibedi | Gibidi | Gebidi, Gebidas | Gebedi, Gebeti |

Yet another *b*-form *Gebodi* occurs, with a suffixal vowel not otherwise recorded. The relationship of the various forms has been studied especially

by R. Much (*ZfdW*, I, pp. 322 ff.), who concludes that the forms in *-b-* go back to the true name of the tribe, while the forms in *-p-* represent an Ostrogothic (² and Visigothic) contemptuous or jocular alteration of the name, made in order to give the tribe a bad character. Jordanes (*Getica*, xvii) tells us that the Goths migrated from Scandinavia to the Vistula valley in three ships, and these ships evidently stand for the three tribes (Ostrogoths, Visigoths and Gibids) into which the migrants came to be divided. The ship which bore the Gibids,

tardior nancta, nomen genti [i.e., to the Gibids] fertur dedisse, nam lingua eorum pigra *gepanta* dicitur. hinc factum est, ut paulatim et corruptae nomen eis ex convicio nasceretur Gepidas. nam sine dubio ex Gothorum prosapie et hi trahent originem; sed quia, ut dixi, *gepanta* pigrum aliquid tardumque designat, pro gratuito convicio Gepidarum nomen exortum est.

Jordanes goes on to speak of the state of mind of the Gibids

dum Spesis provincia commaneret in insulam Visclae [i.e., Vicslae = Vistulae] amnis vadiibus circumactam, quam patrio sermone dicebant Gepedoiios.

Obviously the Gibids held the delta of the Vistula, while the Ostrogoths and Visigoths (as we know) settled up the river on more desirable lands. And no doubt Jordanes' story reflects the actual course of events to this extent, that in the migration from Scandinavia the Gibids were the last-comers, and therefore had to take the leavings, viz., the swampy islands at the mouth of the Vistula. See further T. E. Karsten, *Les Anciens Germains* (tr. F. Mossé), pp. 40, 214.

Of the names given by Jordanes as applied to the region held by the Gibids, the last, *Gepedoros*, is perfectly clear: it means 'the islands of the Gibids.' The alternative name of the region, *Spesis provincia*, is a crux which, so far, has remained unexplained. I connect *Spesis*, semantically, with the *gepanta* 'pigra' of Jordanes. If this connexion holds, *Spesis* may be the Latin gen. sg. of an East Germanic *i*-stem adj. **spēss* < *spēþs* 'late, tardy,' with assimilation as in English *bliss* < *bliþs*. One may conjecture that such an assimilation was characteristic of the Gibid dialect, and that the Goths upstream took advantage of the peculiarity to coin a jocular name for the land of the Gibids—some such name as **Spēss-fēra*. Here, of course, there would be a *double entendre* highly satisfying to the Gothic sense of humour, for **Spēss-fēra* could be taken to mean at the same time (1) a region where everyone said *spēss* for *spēþs*, and (2) a region where everyone was habitually late. It seems needless to add that the latter meaning would fit in admirably with the Gothic etymology of the Gibid name which Jordanes has preserved to us. If my theory is right, then, the *Spesis provincia* of Jordanes is simply a Latin form of Gothic **Spēss-fēra*. Apparently the second element of

the Gothic word was translated outright, while the first was analysed, not incorrectly, as *spēs-* (stem) and *-s* (nom. sg. ending), and the Latin ending *-is* was added to the stem *spēs-* to form the Latin gen. sg. *Spesis* which appears in the text of Jordanes.

However it may be with *Spesis*, we are told by Jordanes himself that *gepanta* 'pigra' is a Gibidic word. And its *e* for *i* and *t* for *d* would have been enough to show that it had no place in the Gothic of Wulfila, even if Jordanes had been silent on the point. Of the *e* I need not speak, but the *t* calls for some explanation. Unluckily, our knowledge of the dialect of the Gibids is practically *nil*, and we are forced to content ourselves with conjecture here, even as in the matter of the Gibidic sound-shift *þs* > *ss*. The gloss 'pigra,' however, makes it reasonable to suppose that Jordanes looked upon *gepanta* as a fem. adj., with ordinary strong (i.e., *ō*-stem) inflexion. Now the corresponding masc. form in Gothic would be **gipands* (with *a*-stem inflexion), and an unvoicing of *d* to *t* among the Gibids in this form would be explicable enough. I conceive, therefore, that the *t* of *gepanta* (nom. sg. fem.) arose in the nom. sg. masc. form and was extended analogically to the fem. in the Gibidic dialect.

That *gepanta* might be used as a noun on occasion is indicated by the second gloss of Jordanes: '*gepanta* means something sluggish and slow.' R. Much seems to think that Jordanes' *aliquid* here makes a neuter noun of *gepanta*, but such an inference is unwarranted. Thus, if Jordanes had said, '*neþla* acutum aliquid designat,' we should hardly be justified in concluding that *neþla* was neuter. I cannot agree, therefore, that Jordanes' two glosses of *gepanta* are inconsistent, so far as the gender of the word is concerned, although the first gloss certainly points to an adjectival, the second to a nominal use of the Gibidic term. Since adjectives are not infrequently used as nouns, Jordanes at most can be convicted of a certain inexactness in his explanations; he might perhaps better have said, '*gepanta* is an epithet applied to something slow.'

The Austrian scholar goes on to argue that *gepanta* was really the nom. sg. masc. of a present participle (with weak inflexion), the ending of which had led Jordanes or his copyist astray as regards the gender of the word. If so, the *t* of *gepanta* is best explained as having been extended from a strong participial form **gepants* (Gothic **gipands*). But since the use of a feminine form would obviously add greatly to the *convicium*, the witness of Jordanes that *gepanta* was feminine is not lightly to be rejected. In any case, however, the fact remains that a distinctly uncomplimentary term *gepanta* existed in the tongue of the Gibids, and that this term, by virtue of more or less malicious and wholly unscientific

etymologising, could be connected with *Gibidae* and was actually seized upon by the Gothic enemies of the Gibids as an excuse for replacing with a *p* the *b* of the tribal name.

One may well be doubtful, it is true, whether such a folk-etymological connexion would readily arise between forms so different as *gepanta* and *Gibidae*. The connexion would be much easier to make with a name, applied to the Gibids or to their country, which had *-and* rather than *-id* as a suffixal element. A regional name **Geband* might well attract to it the *gepanta* of Jordanes, which with jocular and malicious intent could easily be given, in addition to its proper meaning 'slow,' the further meaning 'an inhabitant of **Geband*.' And Jordanes in fact seems to be trying to say that the tardy migrant was first called a *gepanta*, and that *Gepidae* arose out of this term *paulatim et corruptae*. The derivation of the tribal name from the adjective *gepanta* is of course a mere folk-etymology, not to be taken seriously, but its derivation from a regional name **Geband* would be quite parallel to other cases discussed by Lindroth and Noreen in the essays cited above, and deserves careful consideration.

The **Geband*, the existence of which I have inferred from Jordanes' etymology of *Gepidae*, is made up of a base *geb* and the possessive suffix *-and* (Sanskrit *-vant*) familiar in Germanic regional names, and especially in names of islands. The base *geb* may plausibly be connected with Icelandic *geimi* 'sea' and *gima* 'wide opening; strip of clear sky between two clouds'; and, further, with the element *geof*, *gif* in O.E. *geofon*, *gifen* 'sea, ocean.' In **Geband*, as in the English forms, we have the nil-grade *gim* of the base, with dissimilation of *m* to *b* (> *f*) on account of the nasal consonant of the suffix. Compare English *heaven*, where the same dissimilation took place, while the original *m* was preserved in O.N. *himinn*. I take the Germanic base *gaim/gīm/gim* to have had the meaning 'bay,' i.e., a body of water connected with the ocean by an unusually wide opening, an opening so wide, indeed, that one might easily fail to distinguish between the bay itself and the ocean of which it was an extension. In some such meaning the *geimi* and *gima* of Icelandic clearly have a common starting-point suitable to their divergent semantic development. The former word lost the element 'opening (between two land areas)' in the meaning of the base, and thus came to mean 'unrestricted body of water,' i.e., 'the ocean.' The latter word, on the other hand, lost the element 'body of water,' and thus came to mean 'wide opening.' In **Geband*, however, the element *geb* kept its old meaning 'bay,' and **Geband* itself may be defined as 'bay-district, tract of land possessing

a bay.' No better example of a bay wide open on the seaward side could be found than the *Danziger Bucht*, on the shores of which the Gibids had their home.

If my theory is sound, the tribal name *Gibid-* (a consonant stem) was formed, like O.N. *Virðar* from *Verand* and *Egðir* from *Agand*, by adding the suffix of appurtenance *-ið* to the first element of **Geband*. The various recorded forms of the tribal name point to ablaut in the suffix: the form *Gebodi*, if genuine, shows the *u*-variety of the full grade of the suffixal vowel, and the English forms apparently go back to the nil-grade of this vowel—a peculiarity which also serves to account for the want of Vernerian change in the O.E. suffixal spirant. The variation between *e* and *i* in base and suffix in the classical monuments, however, need not be taken to reflect a corresponding variation in living East-Germanic speech, which in all likelihood made use of the form *Gibid-* only. The variation between *e* and *i* in the base of the two English forms may be explained in either of two ways. On the one hand, it may be taken as a survival of the original consonant-stem inflexion of the word, which would call for an *i* in the nom. acc., an *e* in the gen. dat. pl. forms. On this theory, the *e* of the *Widsith* form is that proper to the dat. pl., while the *i* of the *Beowulf* form is a result of levelling. On the other hand, we may explain the *i* as a West-Saxon development, since in this dialect of Old English a stressed initial *ge-* became *giē- > gi-*.

II.

81 . . . mid Hælepum . . .

The name *Hæleþan* answers phonetically to the *hólðar* 'men' of O.N. poetry, a *herti* which, like *ýtar*, *virðar* and the like, presumably goes back to a tribal name. I analyse the name into a base *hal* and the *u*-variety of the full grade of the suffix of appurtenance. The base *hal* means etymologically 'that which is covered, protected or hidden.' It bears the same relation to the O.E. verb *helan* that *νομός* bears to *νέμω*. Many concrete meanings might go back to such a concept, of course. The particular meaning with which we here have to do is 'horn, corner, angle,' and *hal* in this sense was applied to a triangular district in North Jutland, protected or covered on one side by the Randers Firth, on the other by the Kattegat. Here was the original home of the *Χάλοι* of Ptolemy, although this tribe seems early to have extended its territory well into the interior and even across the firth. The Ptolemaic name for the tribe shows a stem made of the simple base *hal*, without any suffixal element. The Danish name *Halla heret* 'district of the Hallar,' however,

first mentioned in the thirteenth century *Jordebog* of King Valdemar II, shows a more complex form of the tribal name, with *ll* < *lþ* (see A. Noreen, *Geschichte der nordischen Sprachen*, 3rd ed., p. 103); in other words, the stem here is made up of the base *hal* and the nil-grade of the suffix of appurtenance. The localisation of the *Χάλοι* of Ptolemy in this Danish district (the modern Hald) was first made by J. H. Bredsdorff in 1824. It was reaffirmed by J. Neuhaus in 1918, and by E. Wadstein in 1925. Since Ptolemy definitely puts his *Χάλοι* in North Jutland, the connexion with the Hald district seems indeed as certain as any Ptolemaic localisation can well be¹. Neuhaus goes on to identify Ptolemy's *Χάλουσος* river with the Guden river (of which the Randers Firth is the lower part). Since Ptolemy does not put the *Χάλουσος* in the Cimbric peninsula, Neuhaus's identification must remain doubtful. But a Germanic consonant stem **Halus* may well have been the old name for the territory held by the *Χάλοι*. Such a name, made up of the base *hal* and the nil-grade of the possessive suffix *wes* (Sanskrit *-vas*)², would mean 'tract of land possessing a horn, corner or angle.' With this district name **Halus* the river name recorded in Ptolemy would perhaps be identical, if Neuhaus is right in his localisation of the Ptolemaic stream³.

Alternatively, one may suppose that **Halus* originated as a river or firth name, and that the tribal name-forms *Χάλοι*, *Hallar*, *Höldar*, were derived from it. If so, **Halus* may be defined as 'body of water giving shelter, cover or protection,' with primary reference to the Randers Firth. This explanation would have been most attractive if Ptolemy had put his *Χάλουσος* river in North Jutland, but his failure to do this makes doubtful any connexion of tribal and river names.

The *Hæleþan* of *Widsith* were first identified with the *Χάλοι* of Ptolemy by von Grienberger (*Angla*, XLVI, p. 372), who, however, does not (1) localise the tribe in the Hald district of Jutland, (2) explain the difference in form between the English and the Ptolemaic name, or (3) make the further connexions with the Danish *Hallar* and the Icelandic *Höldar*. The connexion with *Höldar* points to a medial *u* in the English form of the name, of course. The original nom. pl. in O.E., then, was **Haluþi* (consonant stem), a form which by *i*-umlaut became **Halyþi* > **Hæliþi* (Luick, p. 278). Later the final *-i* was lost, and the

¹ Bredsdorff, *Det skandinaviske Litteraturselskabs Skrifter*, xx, p. 223; Neuhaus, *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi*, 4th series, VII, p. 95; Wadstein, *Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift*, 1925, III, pp. 192 f.

² See G. Mahlow, *KZ*, LVIII (1931), pp. 42 ff.

³ For another localisation, see G. Kossinna, in *IF*, VII (1897), p. 286 n. The connexion which Kossinna makes with the Øresund suffers from phonological difficulties.

medial *i* was lowered to *e* (Luick, pp. 282, 300). That the name eventually went over to the *n*-stems is indicated by the O.E. personal name *Hæleþa* (Redin, p. 76). The vocalism of the dat. pl. *Hæleþum* of our text is due to the influence of the nom.; the normal phonological development of the dat. pl. would have given **Haloþum*¹.

III.

84 Mīd Moidum ic wæs...

This tribal name-form is marked by an archaic spelling *oi* for the sound [ø]. I derive the stem *mōid* [mød] from a primitive *mōhid-*, made up of a base *mōh* and the *i*-variety of the full grade of the suffix of appurtenance. The base *mōh* is familiar in the name of the Danish island of Møn. The Moids of *Widsith*, then, were the inhabitants of Møn.

Møn was well known in the early Middle Ages for its harbour, and as the scene of a battle referred to in the *Sæmundar Edda*². The old name of the island seems to have been **Mōi*, a word made up of a base *mōh* and an *aja*-suffix. Adam of Bremen (iv, 16) calls the island *Moyland* (v.l. *Moiland*), and the name of the sea king Móir of the *Snorra Edda*³ is to be explained either as Mói personified or, better, as the man of Mói. If we take the latter alternative, it follows that the inhabitants of the island might well have been called **Móiar* by the ancient Scandinavians, and such a tribal name would seem to be a perfectly legitimate formation. *Móir* (nom. sg.) and **Móiar* (nom. pl.) are case-forms of the Germanic stem **Mōhaja-*, and go back to **Mōhajaz* > **Mōharaz* > **Mōhēr* and **Mōhajōz* > **Mōhaiar* > *Mōhēar* respectively⁴. But a name for the inhabitants of Mói could also be made by adding to the base *mōh* of the island name the suffix of appurtenance in one of its forms, and such a name is the *Moide* of *Widsith*.

Alongside *Mói* we find another form of the name of the Danish island, a form marked by an *n*-suffix the connexions of which have not been determined with certainty. In the *Sæmundar Edda* the island is called *Móins* (gen. sg.). Bugge conjectures (*loc. cit.*) that the *n* of this form goes back to *-vin*, a familiar second element in place-names. The occurrence

¹ Most editors of *Widsith* emend to *Hæreþum* the *Hæleþum* of the text, on grounds which must be described as frivolous. Such tampering with a name perfectly explicable without emendation cannot too strongly be condemned.

² 'Helgakviða Hundingsbana I,' 45 (ed. Dettler-Heinzel. Leipzig, 1903, I, p. 79). See S. Bugge, *Home of the Eddic Poems*, pp. 139 ff. (*Helgedigtene*, pp. 135 ff.), and N. M. Petersen, *Samlede Afhandlinger*, II, pp. 100 f.

³ See F. Jónsson, *Den Norsk-Islandske Skjaldedigtning*, B I, p. 658.

⁴ See A. Noreen, *Altislandische Grammatik*², Sections 139, 230, 370, 371.

of *um* in Danish place-names, however, is highly doubtful¹, and, besides, there are obvious phonological and morphological difficulties involved in Bugge's theory. It therefore seems more plausible to suppose that the final *n* of *Móin* is nothing more than the *n*-suffix which, as Lindroth has pointed out (*Namn och Bygd*, III, p. 23), is so frequent in names of islands. Such a suffix occurs, e.g., in the familiar *Scadin(avia)* of the ancients, the *Sceden(ig)* of *Beowulf*, 1686. It will be noted that the *n*-suffix is wanting in the other Beowulfian form of this name, the *Scede(land)* of line 19, as well as in the Lappish gen. sg. *Skadesn* of the same stem (on which see further Lindroth, *loc. cit.*). The Greek form Σκανδία recorded by Ptolemy likewise wants the *n*-suffix, although it exhibits in the base an intrusive (? scribal) *n*, or possibly an *n*-infix. Apart from this infix, the Ptolemaic form obviously answers with precision to O.E. *Scede*. It seems clear that the Germanic stem under discussion might be used either with or without the *n*-suffix. Here therefore we have a definite parallel to the alternation between *Móin*, *Møn* and *Möen* on the one hand and *Moyland*, *Móir* and *Mordum* on the other.

It remains to consider the *i*-umlaut which appears in the East-Scandinavian forms *Møn* and *Moen*. If the unumlauted Icelandic *Móin* goes back to a primitive **Mōharn-* or **Mōhajan-*, with full grade of the suffix, then *Møn* and *Moen* can obviously be got from the corresponding nil-grade forms **Mōhn-* and **Mōhyan-*. The base *mōh* upon which all forms of the name of the island are built is to be identified with the Danish dialectal word *mo* 'marl,' as Bugge, *loc. cit.* (following Abildgaard and others), has pointed out. On the etymology of *mo*, see especially Torp, s.v. The later Icelandic form *Món*, recorded, e.g., in the *Knyttlingasaga*, is simply an Icelandic adaptation of the Danish *Møn*, and therefore may be disregarded here².

IV.

84 Mid Moidum ic wæs ond mid Persum ond mid Myrgingum
 ond Mofdingum ond Ongendmyrgingum.

This passage follows two lines (usually rejected as an interpolation) in which are named various peoples of the orient. Editors and commentators, accordingly, have rushed to the conclusion that ll. 84 f. also have reference to oriental peoples, and have interpreted the tribal names of the passage in that sense. In fact, of course, only one of the tribal

¹ See M. Olsen, *Farms and Fanes*, Oslo, 1928, p. 191.

² The *Mordum* of *Widsith* is usually explained as a reference to the Medes, but this explanation does not account for the *oi* of the text.

names, the *Persum* of line 84, can without emendation be given an oriental connexion, and *Persum* itself can readily be interpreted as a reference to the inhabitants of the island in the Seine which the Frankish King Clovis chose as his royal seat. We have just seen that *Moidum* refers to the inhabitants of an island, and it seems not unreasonable to conclude that *Persum* has a similar reference. The Germanic character of *Myrgingum* and *Ongendmyrgingum* is evident, and can be removed only by emendation¹. The curious form *Mofdingum* remains. Since line 85 must have vocalic alliteration, and since the preposition *mid* is wanting before the tribal name, one is practically forced to take the initial *m* of *Mofdingum* as the residue of the missing *mid*. If we so take it, the half-line becomes 'ond m[ɪd] Ofdingum,' with the needed preposition and the needed vocalic alliteration.

The tribal name *Ofdingum* (dat. pl.) which our reading gives to us has a stem which for the moment may be divided into a base *ofd* and a suffix *ing*. We are here concerned primarily with *ofd*, which I connect with the Gothic personal name *Ovida*, recorded by Jordanes (*Getica*, xxii). The historian of the Goths is setting forth the pedigree of the illustrious Gothic King Geberich, the predecessor of Ermanric. The passage reads as follows (ed. Mommsen, p. 87):

...Geberich virtutis et nobilitatis eximius. Nam hic Hilderith patre natus, avo Ovida, proavo Nidada, gloriam generis sui factis illustribus exaequavit.

Jordanes does not give the name of this illustrious family, but I take it it was known as the Ovidings, after Ovida the grandfather of King Geberich, much as another famous Gothic family was called the Amalungs, after Amala the grandfather of King Ostrogotha (the Eastgota of *Widsith*, 113). To be compared are the Scyldings of *Beowulf*, a Danish dynasty named after Scyld, the putative grandfather of King Healfdene, and the Merovings of Frankish history, a dynasty named after Merovech, the grandfather of King Clovis. And just as the Danes, in poetry at least, might be called Scyldings, so the Goths might be called Ovidings in a poetical monument like *Widsith*.

The O.E. form *Ofdingas*, however, answers rather to a Gothic **Ōbadig-gōs* than to the **Ōbidaggōs* which one may infer from the *Ovida* of Jordanes. In other words, O.E. *Ofdingas* points to **Ōbada* as an alternative form, once current, of the name of Geberich's grandfather, a form which bears an obvious ablaut relationship to the *Ovida* (i.e., **Ōbida*) actually on record. That an ablaut form **Ōbada* really existed alongside **Ōbida* is

¹ The reading *Ongendmyrgingum* is made certain by the *Wipmyginga* of line 118, obviously a variant form of the same tribal name.

rendered likely by the name of Ovida's father the *-ada* of *Nidada* and the *-ida* of *Ovida* must be taken together, and the occurrence of the two forms of the suffix proves that ablaut had a place in the family name-giving. But the very form which we are considering is recorded, although with strong instead of weak inflexion, in the *Historia* of Victor Vitensis, who twice mentions a Vandal named Obadus (II, xv, 43-4; ed. C. Halm, p. 23). We may feel reasonably certain, then, that the Goths in poetical diction might be referred to as Obadings, by way of allusion to the dynasty of Geberich, and that the name has come down to us in the *Ofdingas* of *Widsith* 85¹. The *ofd* of this name goes back to a base *ōf* (Gothic *ōb*) and the *a*-variety of the full grade of the suffix of appurtenance. The base *ōf* appears also in German *uben* and related words; note especially O.H.G. *uobo* 'tiller (of the soil).' The name *Ovida* seems to mean 'worker, a man who accomplishes things,' much as *Fastida* means 'keeper, a man who maintains things.' To O.H.G. *uobo* would answer an O.E. **ōfa*, which does not occur as a common noun, but is not infrequent as a personal name, if the *Ofa* of the records had a long *o*. Unluckily we cannot be sure of the quantity of the vowel hereⁱⁿ and a wholly different etymology of the name is therefore possible, for which see Redin, pp. 101 f.

V.

60 ...mid Winedum...

This tribal name is recorded also in the *Orosius* of Alfred the Great, who in his description of Germany speaks of the *Winedas*, and of *Wineda lond* (ed. Sweet, p. 16), and whose Norwegian retainer Ohthere is represented as using the same form of the name (ed. cit., p. 19). Alfred's other retainer Wulfstan, however, who was an Angle, uses another form of the tribal name: he speaks once of *Winodland*, thrice of *Weonodland*, and once of *Weonoðland* (ed. cit., pp. 19 f.). The various English forms thus show a base *win* and three varieties of the suffix of appurtenance: (1) *ið* > *ed*, (2) *uð* > *od* and (3) *uþ* > *oþ*. The *þ* of Wulfstan is supported by the Tacitean and Jordanean form *Venethi*. The occurrences of the name in classical writers have been assembled by Schönfeld (pp. 280 f.), who gives the following additional forms: *Venedi*, *Venadi*, **Venidi*, **Vnidi*, *Venethae*, *Winidae*, *Winadae*. Here *Venadi* and *Winadae* bear witness to the occurrence of a fourth variety, *að*, of the suffix of appurtenance.

The base *win* which I have deduced from the O.E. forms may go back equally well, of course, to an earlier *win* or *wen*; the oldest classical

¹ For the syncope, see Luick, p. 279.

spellings point to *wen* as the original form of the base. This *wen* has plausibly been connected with O.E. *wine* 'friend,' Irish *fine* 'relationship' and the like (see R. Much, *Paul und Braunes Beiträge*, xx, pp. 18 f.). On this interpretation, the Wined name probably expressed a belief that the members of the tribe had a common ancestor. The name is of Germanic origin, but in the records is applied to a Slavic tribe, or, more generally, to the Slavs as a whole. It has been conjectured that the original bearers of the name were a Germanic tribe, who, after imposing their rule and name on a Slavic population, were absorbed into this population, like the Russians of later times. The theory seems plausible enough, but evidence on the point is wholly wanting, unless indeed the inclusion of the Wineds in *Widsith* be taken to have a bearing on the matter. See further S. Feist's speculations in *Language*, viii (1932), pp. 246 ff.

KEMP MALONE.

BALTIMORE, U.S.A.

‘MANSFIELD PARK’ AND KOTZEBUE’S ‘LOVERS’ VOWS’

WHEN Mrs Inchbald translated Kotzebue’s *Kind der Liebe* for the English stage in 1798 under the title of *Lovers’ Vows*, she was forging the first link in the chain that was to bind it inseparably to *Mansfield Park*. Yet the play itself and its author were so completely forgotten in 1911, that Dr A. C. Bradley speaks of owing ‘the identification of *Lovers’ Vows* to Mr Mackail¹.’ In 1923 Mrs Inchbald’s translation was reprinted in the Oxford edition of the novels; because, as Mr Chapman pointed out, ‘without such familiarity with *Lovers’ Vows* as Miss Austen assumes her readers to possess, a large part of the first volume is not fully intelligible².’ And yet as late as 1931 Mr Bailey could actually write: ‘But the long business of the play is rather a bore because we have none of us read *Lovers’ Vows*, and so we are all at sea in the eternal discussions about it³.’ ‘Since this was written,’ he added in a footnote, ‘it has been acted in Oxford, and it is printed in the Oxford edition.’ Mr Rhydderch, on the other hand, certainly realised the significance of *Lovers’ Vows*; for he made, though he did not develop, the statement: ‘You have only to read this play to find how interwoven is its plot with that of *Mansfield Park*⁴.’

The real fact of the case I believe to be this: *Mansfield Park* is nothing more nor less than *Lovers’ Vows* translated into terms of real life with the moral standard subverted by Kotzebue neatly re-inverted. The result is a novel so totally unlike the original play that the relationship between them is the very reverse of obtrusive. But an analysis of the plots and subplots of both productions lays bare such resemblances in structure and situations as cannot be attributed to coincidence. It should, however, be pointed out that, whilst there is no logical connexion between the plot and the subplot in *Lovers’ Vows*, the unity of structure in *Mansfield Park* hardly admits of the terms. For the sake of convenience, however, I have followed Kotzebue’s scheme, which is reversed in *Mansfield Park*.

¹ A. C. Bradley, *A Miscellany*, London, 1931, p. 48. A lecture on Jane Austen given at Newnham College, Cambridge, in 1911.

² *The Novels of Jane Austen*, ed. by R. W. Chapman, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1926, vol. III, Note on p. 474. All subsequent references are quoted from this edition of *Mansfield Park*.

³ J. Bailey, *Introductions to Jane Austen*, Oxford, 1931, p. 64.

⁴ D. Rhydderch, *Jane Austen, Her Life and Art*, London, 1932, p. 205.

*Lovers' Vows.**A. Plot.*

Agatha Friburg, *the virtuous abandoned mistress of Baron Wildenham, is dragging out a wretched existence in great misery and poverty.* Her situation is accidentally revealed to her now remorseful betrayer by the desperate action of her illegitimate son Frederick. He first begs of his father in the name of a starving mother, and then threatens his life in ignorance of his identity. A recognition between father and son takes place; and, owing to the admonitions of a pious young clergyman called Anhalt, the Baron, already reconciled to his son, promises marriage to Agatha, who is thus raised from her fallen and wretched lot to *happiness, respectability and prosperity.*

B. Subplot.

Baron Wildenham *is torn between worldly and unworldly motives in considering Count Cassel, a fop and a fool, but an excellent match, suitor for the hand of his legitimate daughter Amelia, a bold young ingénue. He sounds her on the subject, and she shows very clearly that she is more than indifferent to the Count*

B. Subplot.

Wildenham, *in the dark as to Cassel's real character, asks Anhalt, the young clergyman, and Amelia's tutor, to plead Count Cassel's cause. Amelia and Anhalt are mutually in love, and she boldly declares her feelings to him. But he, aware that he is socially inferior to her, dare not contemplate marriage. By the timely discovery of Cassel's libertinage, she is freed from his suit. After a struggle Wildenham brings himself to overlook Anhalt's humble station and to welcome him as a son-in-law for the sake of his moral worth.*

*Mansfield Park.**B. Subplot.*

Maria Bertram, *born into happiness, respectability and prosperity but proud, selfish, undisciplined and passionate, enters on a loveless marriage with Mr Rushworth from worldly motives strengthened by pique at the behaviour of Henry Crawford, whose attentions she had allowed and even sought in spite of her engagement, whilst he had been merely trifling with her. After her marriage, circumstances bring Maria and Henry together again. He renews the flirtation, she responds more violently and forces him to make her his mistress. He refuses to marry her; and, finally abandoned, she drags out the remainder of her wretched existence in great misery, shut up together with her aunt Norris in another part of the country, 'remote and private.'*

B. Subplot.

Sir Thomas Bertram *is torn between worldly and unworldly motives in considering Mr Rushworth, a bit of a fop and also a fool, but an excellent match, the prospective husband of his eldest daughter Maria. He sounds her on the subject, and offers to release her from the engagement; but she hides her feelings for the reasons given above, and insists on marrying Mr Rushworth.*

A. Plot.

Sir Thomas, *in the dark as to Crawford's real character, tries to force his niece Fanny Price to accept him, and then asks his son Edmund, a young clergyman and Fanny's mentor, to plead Henry's cause. But Fanny, who loves Edmund, remains unpersuadable, and yet modestly keeps her secret, Edmund being infatuated at the time with Mary Crawford, who however considers him her social inferior. By the timely discovery of Crawford's libertinage Fanny is freed from his suit. Edmund, his eyes now also opened on the subject of Mary's character, turns to Fanny at last. And Sir Thomas is brought by circumstances to overlook her humble station and to welcome her as a daughter-in-law for the sake of her moral worth.*

Jane Austen has done more than clothe a skeleton with flesh and blood; she has completely transformed what her hand has touched. The life-giving quality of her mind, playing over the preposterous characters offered to her by Kotzebue, changed them all into real men and women, doubled three of them, created scores of others, added a wealth of fascinating incidents and invented subtle relationships of which her original shows no trace.

Maria and Julia Bertram represent Miss Austen's conception of a potential 'Agatha,' or erring woman. That 'odious, little, pert, unnatural girl' Amelia has been transformed into Mary Crawford and her opposite, Fanny Price. Count Cassel reappears as Mr Rushworth, and also as Henry Crawford. Sir Thomas Bertram's 'desire for seeing all that were connected with him in situations of respectability' betrays his kinship with Baron Wildenhaim; and Edmund, that 'formal solemn lecturer,' never quite shakes off Anhalt. There is a faint resemblance, but no more, between Amelia's half-brother Frederick and young William Price; but the fraternal relationship plays no real part in *Lovers' Vows*.

The situations taken over by Jane Austen all undergo the same change from cut-and-dried artificiality to complex reality, and the moral standards are altered throughout. The readjustment of the ethical values necessitated a total change in the character of Agatha-Maria, and the fortune which befell her. Virtuous women do not fall, according to Miss Austen's moral philosophy; and women who lose their virtue must not expect to be rehabilitated. There remains the similarity in their situations after the sin has been committed; and this is close enough to be extremely telling when the relative positions in time are considered: Agatha's is described at the beginning of the play, Maria's at the end of the novel.

Lovers' Vows.

Agatha. ...As soon as my situation became known, I was questioned, and received many severe reproaches: but I refused to confess who was my undoer; and for that obstinacy was turned from the castle. I went to my parents; but their door was shut against me. My mother, indeed, wept as she bade me quit her sight for ever; but my father wished increased affliction might befall me (pp. 487 f.).

Mansfield Park.

...*She* must withdraw...to a retirement and reproach, which could allow no second spring of hope or character.... Mrs Norris...would have had her received at home, and countenanced by them all. Sir Thomas would not hear of it.... Maria had destroyed her own character, and he would not by a vain attempt to restore what never could be restored, be affording his sanction to vice... (pp. 464 f.).

Sir Thomas is twice tempted to favour a loveless match for the sake

of worldly advantages. On the first occasion he is in much the same predicament as the Baron: for Count Cassel is superficially not unlike Mr Rushworth, and a daughter's happiness is involved in each case. But whereas the Baron's test is a test in name only, Maria's father is assailed by real doubts and scruples; but he allows them to be too easily satisfied, and lives to rue the day.

Lovers' Vows.

Baron . . . And am I after all to have an ape for a son-in-law? No. I shall not be in a hurry. I love my daughter too well. We must be better acquainted before I give her to him. I shall not sacrifice my Amelia to the will of others, as I myself was sacrificed. The poor girl might, in thoughtlessness, say yes, and afterwards be miserable (pp. 493 f.).

(There follows a scene between Wildenham and Amelia, in which her complete indifference to Cassel is manifested in a would-be humorous manner.)

Mansfield Park.

Not all his good-will for Mr Rushworth could prevent him from soon discerning some part of the truth—that Mr Rushworth was an inferior young man. . . . He had expected a very different son-in-law; and beginning to feel grave on Maria's account, tried to understand *her* feelings. Little observation there was necessary to tell him that indifference was the most favourable state they could be in. . . . Sir Thomas resolved to speak seriously to her. Advantageous as would be the alliance. . . . her happiness must not be sacrificed to it. Mr Rushworth had perhaps been accepted on too short an acquaintance, and on knowing him better, she was repenting. With solemn kindness Sir Thomas addressed her. . . . (p. 200).

(Maria refuses to be released.)

It will be noticed that the parallel here is close; it is the difference between Amelia and Maria which weights the scales in the parental interviews. Maria is really more to blame than Sir Thomas; who nevertheless later endures great agony of mind for having allowed the marriage: Wildenham is guiltless in this matter (the remorse he suffers in his relationship with Agatha-Maria is on another account). A thoroughly conventional conflict has been transmuted into a painfully interesting one.

The Baron is represented as wavering for some time on the subject of Cassel and Amelia, although his final decision is never really in doubt. Sir Thomas, on the other hand, is put to another and a more searching test when Henry Crawford makes his gratifying proposal for the hand of Fanny Price. For there is nothing, absolutely nothing, against this suitor, her uncle believes, except her unaccountable refusal to return the young man's love.

Lovers' Vows.(Cp. Act II, Sc. 2, *passim*.)

Baron. But I think proper to acquaint you he is rich, and of great consequence: rich, and of consequence, do you hear?

Amelia. Yes, dear papa. But my tutor has always told me that birth and fortune are inconsiderable things, and cannot give happiness.

Baron. There he is right—But if it happens that birth and fortune are joined with sense and virtue—

Amelia. But is it so with Count Cassel?

Baron. Hem! Hem! [*Aside*] (p. 495).

Anhalt. . . . What remains to interest you in favour of a man, whose head and heart are good for nothing?

Baron. Birth and fortune. Yet, if I thought my daughter absolutely disliked him, or that she loved another, I would not thwart a first affection;—no, for the world, I would not. [*Sighing*] But that her affections are already bestowed, is not probable (pp. 499 f.).

Mansfield Park.(Cp. vol. III, ch. I, *passim*.)

'Here is a young man of sense, of character, of temper, of manners, and of fortune, exceedingly attached to you, and seeking your hand in the most handsome and disinterested way; and let me tell you, Fanny, that you may live eighteen years longer in the world, without being addressed by a man of half of Mr Crawford's estate or a tenth part of his merits' (p. 319).

'Have you any reason, child, to think ill of Mr Crawford's temper?'

'No, Sir.'

She longed to add, 'but of his principles I have...' (p. 317).

She had hoped that to a man like her uncle... the simple acknowledgment of settled *dislike* on her side would have been sufficient. To her infinite grief she found it was not (p. 318).

'Young as you are, and having seen scarcely any one, it is hardly possible that your affections—' He paused and eyed her fixedly... and chusing at least to appear satisfied, he quickly added, 'No, no, I know *that* is quite out of the question—quite impossible...' (p. 316).

(Sir Thomas would certainly have thwarted Fanny's first affection at this juncture, had it been bestowed on either Edmund or Tom.)

Sir Thomas' attempts to coerce Fanny are strongly contrasted with the leniency of Wildenhaim, the change being here once more in the interests of real life. The situation is also so humorously treated that it is impossible to wish Sir Thomas to behave otherwise.

The central scene of Kotzebue's subplot is the dialogue between Anhalt and Amelia on the subject of Count Cassel and matrimony, a simple situation, depicting a foregone conclusion. Amelia listens to Anhalt's description of a happy and an unhappy marriage; she then declares that she loves her tutor and that she is determined to marry him; a statement which he receives with mingled rapture and alarm; since, being only a clergyman, he fears the Baron's resentment for aspiring to his daughter's hand. Kotzebue allowed Amelia to blurt out her declaration point-blank: Mrs Inchbald added some hesitation and maiden modesty. 'The forward and unequivocal manner in which she announces her affection to her lover, in the original, would have been revolting to an English

audience.' It did her little service with Miss Austen, who considered the language of Amelia 'unfit to be expressed by any woman of modesty.' Nevertheless, this scene, in spite of her disapproval, or rather because of it, has become an integral part of the structure of *Mansfield Park*. To begin with, the relationship between Anhalt and Amelia, tutor and pupil in *Lovers' Vows*, is adopted for the hero and heroine in *Mansfield Park*, a relationship ripening naturally, gradually and inevitably into love.

Lovers' Vows.

(Cp. Act III, Sc 2, *passim*.)

Amelia: ...you taught me geography, languages, and other important things. (A few lines before she also instances mathematics) (p. 506).

Amelia: ...My father has more than once told me that he who forms my mind I should always consider as my greatest benefactor. [*Looking down*] And my heart tells me the same.

Anhalt: I think myself amply rewarded by the good opinion you have of me.

Amelia: When I remember what trouble I have sometimes given you, I cannot be too grateful (pp. 503 f.).

Mansfield Park.

Miss Lee taught her French, and heard her read her daily portion of History; but he recommended the books which charmed her leisure hours, he encouraged her taste, and corrected her judgment. . . In return for such services she loved him better than any body in the world except William... (p. 22).

Having formed her mind and gained her affections, he had a good chance of her thinking like him (p. 64).

Her sentiments towards him were compounded of all that was respectful, grateful, confiding, and tender (p. 37).

Then comes the trial. 'He [Anhalt] came to me by your command,' Amelia later informs Wildenhaim, 'to examine my heart respecting Count Cassel. I told him that I would never marry the Count.' Fanny could have used the identical words to Sir Thomas about Edmund and Henry Crawford. But whereas Anhalt is already slavishly in love with Amelia, Fanny is in the excruciating position of hearing the man she loves urging her to marry the man she cordially dislikes; knowing all the time too that Edmund is in love with Mary Crawford. And, diametrically opposite from Amelia in this, she guards her secret intact—a living antithesis and reproach to her prototype in the play. But it was not enough. Both girls, it will be noticed, reap the same reward. In the nick of time both Cassel and Crawford are unmasked, and the clergyman wins the bride. Modesty and immodesty come to the same end.

This would not do. Mary Crawford was created to reap where the indelicate Amelia had sown; and Mary and Fanny must therefore (to drive the point home) share Edmund's affections between them.

I would not have the shadow of a coolness between the two whose intimacy I have been observing with the greatest pleasure, and in whose characters there is so much

general resemblance in true generosity and natural delicacy as to make the few slight differences, resulting principally from situation, no reasonable hindrance to a perfect friendship. I would not have the shadow of a coolness arise...between the two dearest objects I have on earth (pp. 263 f.).

So spoke Edmund; but in reality Fanny and Mary are only alike in attracting and valuing Edmund. 'In every thing but a value for Edmund Miss Crawford was very unlike her.' Burdened with Amelia's want of modesty, Mary was also made to shoulder and express in another way Kotzebue's patronising views on the social status of the clergy. In *Lovers' Vows* Anhalt shares with Cottager and Cottager's Wife the doubtful privilege of representing moral worth among the lower orders. Miss Austen felt it incumbent on her to protest. What had been a manufactured obstacle to the course of true love in the play became one of the *leit-motifs* of the novel. For Mary Crawford, unlike Amelia, considers Edmund's profession as a serious drawback because of the incorrigible, ineradicable worldliness of her nature. 'Punished for her worldliness, Mary is also condemned for her immodesty. Her indelicate allusions to the Admiral's loose life shock both Fanny and Edmund at the outset of their acquaintance with her. Like Amelia, she unblushingly owns that she has no disinclination to the married state. She meets Edmund's advances more than half way; but the real contrast lies in the difference between her feelings and Fanny's after the catastrophe—very strongly brought out:

Fanny seemed to herself never to have been shocked before. There was no possibility of rest. The evening passed, without a pause of misery, the night was totally sleepless. She passed only from feelings of sickness to shudderings of horror; and from hot fits of fever to cold. The event was so shocking, that there were moments even when her heart revolted from it as impossible—when she thought it could not be. A woman married only six months ago, a man professing himself devoted, even *engaged*, to another—that other her near relation—the whole family, both families connected as they were by the upon tie, all friends, all intimate together!—it was too horrible a confusion of guilt, too gross a complication of evil, for human nature, not in a state of utter barbarism, to be capable of!—yet her judgment told her it was so (p. 441).

Mary's comments on the situation between Henry and Maria are totally different:

So she began—but how she went on, Fanny, is not fit—is hardly fit to be repeated to you. I cannot recall all her words. I would not dwell upon them if I could. Their substance was great anger at the *folly* of each....Guess what I must have felt. To hear the woman whom—no harsher name than folly given!—So voluntarily, so freely, so coolly to canvas it!—No reluctance, no horror, no feminine—shall I say? no modest loathings! (pp. 454 f.).

The resemblance between the part played by Cassel in the play and by

Crawford in the novel will have already become apparent; but some parallel passages must be given in order to underline it:

Lovers' Vows.

(Cp. Act iv, Sc. 2, *passim*.)

Baron: What has he done?

Amelia: Oh! told me of such barbarous deeds he has committed!

Baron: What deeds?

Amelia: Made vows of love to so many women, that, on his marriage with me, a hundred female hearts will be broken (p. 516).

Amelia: ...our old Butler told my waiting-maid of a poor young creature who had been deceived, undone; and she, and her whole family, involved in shame and sorrow by his perfidy (p. 516).

Butler: ...But in plain truth, my Lord, the Count was treacherous, cruel, forsworn... (p. 518).

Count: ...for me to keep my word to a woman, would be deceit: 'tis not expected of me. It is in my character to break oaths in love... (p. 521).

Mansfield Park.

'Oh! the envyings and heart-burnings of dozens and dozens!' (p. 360).

'But were I to attempt to tell you of all the women whom I have known to be in love with him, I should never have done' (p. 362).

'Ah! I cannot deny it. He has now and then been a sad flirt, and cared very little for the havoc he might be making in young ladies' affections' (Mary to Fanny) (p. 363).

...and it appeared to her [Fanny] that as far as this world alone was concerned, the greatest blessing to every one of kindred with Mrs Rushworth would be instant annihilation (p. 442).

.. the clandestine, insidious, treacherous admirer of Maria Bertram... (pp. 327 f.)

As to Mr Crawford, she hoped it might give him a knowledge of his own disposition, convince him that he was not capable of being steadily attached to any one woman in the world... (p. 438).

The fundamental difference between Count Cassel and Henry Crawford lies in the fascination of the latter, whereas the former is a negligible fool.

The protest underlying the scheme of *Mansfield Park* is now tolerably clear. In *Lovers' Vows* Kotzebue had condoned and rewarded immorality in the person of Agatha; Jane Austen condemned it mercilessly and punished it savagely in Maria Rushworth. He had depicted immodesty in an attractive light in Amelia; she exalted the opposite virtue in Fanny Price and flagellated indelicacy in the person of Mary Crawford. He had relegated Anhalt among the lower orders; she made Edmund Bertram a man of unexceptionable birth. He had allowed Baron Wildenheim to win an easy victory over worldliness; she showed Sir Thomas Bertram succumbing to a particularly insidious temptation. In a word, she took over his paltry situations and gave them a profoundly human significance. She also used the rehearsals of *Lovers' Vows* as a crisis, a turning-point in the story which presents the leading characters between two possible lines of conduct, and finally the play itself is prophetic of things to come; as the casting of the parts brings out:

334 'Mansfield Park' and Kotzebue's 'Lovers' Vows'

| Lovers' Vows | | Mansfield Park | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|---|---|
| Mansfield Stage | | The Present | The Future | The End |
| Wildenham | Mr Yates | | Sir Thomas Bertram (sub-plot of <i>Lovers' Vows</i>) | Henry Crawford (plot of <i>Lovers' Vows</i>) |
| Agatha | Maria Bertram | | | Maria Rushworth |
| Frederick | Henry Crawford | | | |
| Count Cassel | Mr Rushworth | Mr Rushworth | Henry Crawford | |
| Amelia | Mary Crawford | Maria Bertram | Fanny Price | |
| | | Mary Crawford | Mary Crawford | Fanny Price |
| Anhalt | Edmund Bertram | Edmund Bertram | Edmund Bertram | Edmund Bertram |
| Butler | } Tom Bertram | | | |
| Landlord | | | | |
| Cottager etc. | | | | |
| Cottager's Wife | Mrs Grant | | | |
| Country girl | ? Probably cut out | | | |

Tom Bertram need not detain us; the 'trifling part' of the rhyming Butler, and 'the insignificance of all his parts together' are apparent. And Mrs Grant, who undertook Cottager's Wife to save Fanny from further bullying, may also be ignored. Mr Yates too is relatively unimportant. As far as the plot of *Lovers' Vows* is concerned, there was dramatic fitness in giving him the part of Wildenham; for he was just the kind of young man to love and ride away, as the Baron had done in his youth. Although he in no wise resembles Sir Thomas, the two men meet on the stage; and Yates, having ranted his last rant as the Baron, resigns his rôle to the Baronet, who proceeds to enact it with Maria and Mr Rushworth. That young man is meanwhile engaged in caricaturing himself as the suitor of Wildenham's daughter. He is also understudying Crawford's future part; and there is ironical poetic justice in this, since Henry has already stepped into his shoes as Maria's lover. The close connexion between the two men is symbolised in this way. Edmund's case is the simplest of all. This solemn young clergyman is making love to Mary Crawford both off and on the stage, and would fain be forming her mind. He is later to play the part of matrimonial adviser to Fanny, and later still to fall in love with her and bring her home as his bride. In fact he so closely resembles Anhalt that he may almost be regarded as a clue. Henry Crawford as Frederick is merely the *jeune premier*, the most desirable man in the play. In this symbolical sense only, it is the part he is fulfilling in real life. And in this sense too Maria Bertram is his partner. She is to meet Agatha's fate at his hands in the future; whereas Julia, who might have been Agatha, falls to the lot of Mr Yates. And Maria's shadow falls, but no more, over the figure of Amelia, who is being wooed by Cassel (Rushworth-Crawford), part silly but honourable suitor, part reprehensible rake. Mary, however, is obviously more suitable as Amelia

at the moment, and she goes on playing the part of Anhalt's *innamorata* almost up to the end of the book. But Fanny's claims are not entirely overlooked. On the solitary occasion when the crucial scene between Anhalt and Amelia is rehearsed, Edmund looks for Fanny to act it with him, and finds her already going through it with Mary in the east room. The future heroine of this scene then remains to prompt and help them; she is present throughout the rehearsal.

The strong dramatic irony in all this needs no pointing out. *Lovers' Vows* is a prophecy of what is to come, a prefiguration of evil for nearly all the actors involved. For most of them have chosen evil with their eyes open, when they might have chosen good. In Miss Austen's eyes they were doing wrong in deciding to act at all. Edmund voices this opinion strongly before there is any question of representing *Lovers' Vows*. Acting is no fit pursuit for ladies and gentlemen 'who have all the disadvantages of education and decorum to struggle through'; Sir Thomas 'would never wish his grown up daughters to be acting plays.' It is wrong absolutely; doubly wrong in their special circumstances; and trebly wrong when it comes to *Lovers' Vows*. The ringleader Tom suffers severely for it in the future; but he only wants to act the part of the rhyming Butler and 'every trifling one that could be united with' it, and gets off with a warning in the end. The Honourable John Yates, the height of whose theatrical ambition it was 'to storm through Baron Wildenhaim,' later elopes with Julia, whereat the Baronet storms at him. Mr Rushworth chooses to be Count Cassel, for the sake of his fine clothes; he gets a fine wife as a recompense, and all that such finery entails. Henry Crawford is manipulated into his part by Maria; but it is due to his deliberate connivance that she and not Julia is cast to act with him: 'Tragedy may be your choice, but it will certainly appear that comedy chooses *you*,' a subtle reference surely to Julia's future elopement and marriage with silly Mr Yates. 'We cannot have two Agathas,' her creator realised at this point.

The punishment meted out to Edmund for taking the part of Anhalt against his better judgment for the sake of acting with Mary also fits the crime exactly. He sacrifices his scruples to a worthless woman and loses her in the end. And Mary, who accepts the rôle of Amelia with a most unmaidenly alacrity, for the pleasure of making love to Edmund, finally fails to secure him in spite of all her arts and wiles. Only Fanny, who resists to the utmost the pressure to drag her into the play, is to have all her wishes crowned in the future, and to be free from self-reproach. It was a near thing however. Had Sir Thomas not returned from Antigua

in the very nick of time, she would have acted Cottager's Wife for Mrs Grant at the interrupted rehearsal, and been drawn into the circle of disaster merely to oblige Edmund. But she escapes contamination. All the others have been tried and found wanting; she alone has been true. And as they have sown, so shall they reap; they have been predetermining their fates.

It is rare for Miss Austen to face her characters with so definite a choice of so final a nature; nor, however misguided her young people may act, do they generally meet with such merciless retribution. Emma Woodhouse, Jane Fairfax, and in particular Frank Churchill are examples of the leniency and clemency she was generally willing to show to folly and even wrong-doing. But they did not stand accountant for as great a sin as the crime of acting Kotzebue.

And now to consider a crucial point. Did Miss Austen desire her scheme to be recognised or not? At the first blush, it seems as if she must have wished the protest to be properly understood, and the dramatic irony to tell. Edmund as Anhalt looks like a definite clue. 'If *any* part could tempt *you* to act, I suppose it would be Anhalt,' observed the lady, archly, after a short pause—'for he is a clergyman you know.' The similarity between the Christian names of Maria and Mary is possibly another, also *Baron Wildenhaim* and Sir Thomas Bertram, *Baronet*. And the play itself, so well known at the time, and given such a central position in her book, surely it was intended to be used as a key?

It probably was; but as no one availed themselves of it, at least not in print, she seems to have resigned herself with a good grace to being only partially comprehended. Family tradition being silent on this point, it is idle to speculate whether anyone in her circle was in the know. Are we then to suppose that, having gone to such lengths to annihilate Kotzebue, she was perfectly indifferent about the result? Possibly she felt that the section on *Lovers' Vows* was sufficient in itself; and that her ruthless punishment of immorality was telling enough to dispense with the contrast it was meant to suggest. But granted that the moralist was satisfied, what of the humorist and artist whose subtle dramatic irony was rendered null and void? The novel was rich enough without, as she could hardly fail to know. And before she finished *Mansfield Park* she must have been aware that she had paid Kotzebue far too great a compliment by allowing him, even unconsciously, to collaborate with her. There followed a marked reaction from the excessive severity of the moral judgments; they are much softened in *Persuasion*, which is based on the scheme of *Mansfield Park* in much the same manner in which the

latter is based on *Lovers' Vows*; Louisa—Henrietta—Capt. Wentworth and Anne balance Maria—Julia—Henry Crawford and Fanny. But there is nothing so very reprehensible after all in two sisters being violently attracted by a captivating man. It is perhaps wrong to accept 'the attentions... of two young women at once'; but there is no need to 'attribute guile to any'; so reasons the strangely altered Fanny-Anne. The rightful hero, *Frederick* Wentworth, will cause no lasting suffering to anyone, for Henry Crawford has been divided into two: the gallant naval captain¹, and the dissolute Mr Elliot, whom Lady Bertram-Russel vainly advises the heroine to wed.

There are other very significant parallels between the two novels, but an analysis of the relationship would lead me too far; I merely wish to stress the mildness of the author's judgments on the Louisa-Henrietta-Frederick combination, when contrasted with her strictures on the one between Maria, Julia and Henry. This amounts to a recantation. I conclude that Miss Austen actively regretted her ferocity in *Mansfield Park*; and, attributing it (as she had every right to do) to the malignant influence of Kotzebue, she came to rue the day of her unholy alliance with him.

E. M. BUTLER.

CAMBRIDGE.

¹ Henry Crawford once fervently wished that he had entered the navy. Miss Austen fulfils this wish in *Persuasion*, another sign that she relented towards him.

THE LITERARY QUALITY OF LUTHER'S STYLE

AMONG the more surprising results of the recent vogue of the sixteenth century as a field for research is surely to be counted the fact that manifold and varied enquiry has been to the profit, generally speaking, of the literatures of France and England rather than to that of Germany. More problems have been cleared up, and a better understanding obtained, concerning the phenomena of Tudor literature, for example, or of the workings of the French Renaissance, than of the main tendencies of literature in Germany during the same period. In view of the German reputation for thoroughness in scholarship as in everything else, this will seem surprising, but it is doubtless true to say that the German sixteenth century presents a tougher problem than the other two. It saw no Renaissance, and was occupied much more than they with the Reformation, a movement whose literary value is still very much a subject of dispute. Thus while the secrets of all kinds of literary oddments have been unravelled, while an attack has been made on such problematic figures as Murner and Fischart, some of the essential output of the century, and in particular its greatest individual figure, seem to have been rather unaccountably neglected.

The bibliography of Luther has grown to proportions so enormous as to seem almost ludicrous to the casual enquirer, and literary researchers have perhaps been blinded by excess of light. At any rate there has been nobody willing to do for Luther the writer what Merker has done for Murner or Hauffen for Fischart, or Burdach for the fifteenth century, patiently to investigate what there was in him and about him, in his psychology as well as in his career, to make him write as he did. Until that is done we must remain in the dark as to his real place and significance in the literary history of his country.

It is no answer to such questions as these to discourse upon Luther's merits as an exponent and populariser of the new High German language. Pietsch wrote fifty years ago of the extent to which the sale of his books generalised what is assumed to be the speech of the Saxon Chancellery, making what was practically a new tongue the common possession of all reading classes, and Franke has set forth in an exhaustive study the admirable use Luther made of his own tongue.

But literature is more than language, and the use of words in themselves a very different thing from the end they serve. Luther as writer

requires a different criterion and judgment from Luther as linguist, and the real reason why his services to literature remain so problematical is that we have attempted to gauge them by his services to the German language. We are forced to rely on partial investigation and to adopt traditional opinions, as for instance the commonplace of text-books that a part of Luther's writing is of high artistic value, and the rest of merely polemic interest. There is reason, of course, for singling out passages in the hymns and the Bible as of superior worth, but this does not warrant us in treating them as different in kind from the rest.

Since Luther wrote at a time critical for the development of the German language, our attention has been excusably diverted, but have we not with undue haste refused to consider as literature anything apart from the Bible and hymns, on the flimsy ground that it was not written with an artistic end in view? Would not such a decision be in any other field considered unscientific? It certainly raises some awkward questions. Is it reasonable that the most popular writer of his time should have been devoid of literary merit, even in his ephemeral productions, the man whose books created such consistent records of sales that thirty years after his death the profits made on the new Amadis stories were described as actually exceeding those made on Luther's tracts forty years before? Or again, is one to assume that the literary gifts required for the translation of a psalm are other and finer than for the writing of a catechism or devotional treatise? I have urged elsewhere that the artistic finish of certain parts of Luther's work makes imperative an examination of the literary principles underlying the whole, hurried as much of it may be¹. Our present estimate is justified only on the assumption that the pamphlets and treatises lack the genius of the verse and translations—and the assumption has never been proved. A true valuation can come only in the wake of investigation that will give us the answer to other questions besides the main and all-important problem of the quality of Luther's style. It will show us for example in what degree one may speak of chronological development of this quality, under the influence of what moods and occasions Luther finds his real power as writer. It must either corroborate or refute what Saintsbury has gone so far as to term Luther's 'easy and yet strenuous mastery of the whole system of composition'².

Whether the present position be unscientific or no, it is undeniably unfortunate. There is a constant danger that the battle around the

¹ *La Réforme allemande et la littérature française*, Strassburg, 1930, pp. 21 ff.

² G. Saintsbury, *The Earlier Renaissance*, p. 291.

person of the Reformer be transferred to the judgment of his works. Friends see vigour where foes see vulgarity, and both without any foundation save personal taste. Literary historians, by championing Luther on religious or national grounds, have provoked a very natural reaction against his literary eminence, which they accepted in general terms without question. By confusing his literary genius with his personality they have laid themselves open to the rejoinder that being a national hero implies no exclusively literary quality and that since Luther fills the historical scene, he may be almost ignored on that of literature. This reaction seems as difficult to accept as the old indiscriminate enthusiasm. We are, it appears, no longer allowed to think of Luther as the great inaugurator of modern German letters; his work falls outside their main development, and is indeed little more than an interlude in the literary evolution of his country: *Lutherische Pause*.

This contention deserves careful consideration. It is defended in these terms¹: 'Mit Luthers Auftreten beginnt keine neue Epoche in der deutschen Literaturgeschichte. Die Reformation brachte einen neuen religiösen Inhalt aber keine neue weltliche Kultur. Es taucht kein neuer künstlerischer Gedanke auf, um die konfessionellen und theologischen Meinungsverschiedenheiten auf künstlerische Höhe zu heben....' One has sympathy with this point of view, although the conclusions to which it obviously leads will seem to many students unwarranted. Is it not a somewhat daring theory that new religious content implies no new artistic form? Yet in Luther's case the same writer grudgingly admits that it implied something of a new standard of literary art: 'Die grosse Menge von Luthers Schriften gehört der kirchlichen und politischen Geschichte an. Aber auch der Literaturhistoriker muss mit Genugtuung feststellen, dass die deutsche Prosa nun schon als selbstverständliche Ausdrucksform galt. Allerdings hat Luther die stilistische Kunst der Bibelübersetzung nie wieder erreicht, auch nicht gewollt.... Das literarische Leben nahm ein neues Gesicht an. Luthers Auftreten löste dem Deutschen gleichsam die Zunge.' What is all this but the old distinction between the merit of having perfected the language and having written great literature, justified in the face of previous exaggerations, but equally unproven? One is tempted to ask for a definition of terms. If Luther's use of the German tongue resulted merely in a general popularisation of new linguistic forms, it is quite understandable that he brought no new content into literature. If on the other hand one admits the artistic content of a

¹ W. Stammer, *Von der Mystik zum Barock*, Stuttgart, 1927. For a balanced and helpful criticism see the review in *Literary*, 1928, pp. 49 ff., by J. G. Robertson.

part of his work, and that a literary revolution was caused by it, the previous position is manifestly untenable.

Is it not possible, as suggested above, to enquire if there be not certain principles underlying Luther's literary expression, whether he did not merely loosen the tongues of his countrymen, but set before them a body of writing that should reasonably be termed great in stylistic quality? The enquiry is too vast to be more than adumbrated in a single article, but one may at least attempt to piece together its main features, and to point out that the subject awaits the attention of scholars who will apply to it the same method and patience that others have shown in philological investigation. The instruments, one may say, are already there, in the form of critical texts to be studied in the great libraries, or as selections within the compass of a student's purse¹.

Miscellaneous reading of different types of Luther's writing, from sermons and hymns to the hottest invective, would lead one to hazard two principles underlying his literary expression. Both of them tend to bring wealth and variety into the linguistic resources at his disposal, and both sound so simple as hardly to need emphasis, did they not lie at the root of our enquiry. Luther welcomes, in the first place, any and every kind of word for use in any connexion. His vocabulary is potentially almost unlimited, which means that although he does not bring all attested words of his language into use, he is at least ready to do so. With that incoherence that is a mark of his age, he will use within a short distance of each other words borrowed from Latin or other languages, words of common parlance and derivatives formed from them on the spur of the moment. The abstract and the concrete jostle one another in his prose, the physical and the symbolic in his poetry. The name he coined for the common people in a certain mood, *Herr Omnes*, may stand not only as example of a native invention which will be noted in a moment, but of that complete readiness to take words from any source to suit his purpose.

What conditions then his choice of this vast range of expression? One thing only, as far as can be inferred from his general practice: his aim is the swiftest possible expression of his idea. The search after the means of *immediate* impression and conviction is the striking thing in all his

¹ I refer in the first place to the great Weimar edition of sixty volumes, commenced in 1883, to Scherer's reproduction of the *Septemberbibel*, to the critical editions of the hymns and smaller catechism in Litzmann's *Kleine Texte* (Nos. 24-5, 109) and to the so-called 'Bonn' students' edition of selected works by Litzmann and Clemen, of which five volumes have already appeared. When not specified my references are to this last.

writing. The means vary: argument, comparison, simile, appeal, invective, but common to all is this immediacy that overthrows each as soon as the required point has been made. What he said of Scripture may often apply to his own style: 'Es sind nicht faule, noch tote, sondern schefftige lebendige wort' (iv, 18). Thus in one of the earliest published sermons he ends an appeal to Christian people to cease purchasing indulgences with these few insignificant words tacked on to his final sentence, 'gang du fur dich,' so homely that none could be more direct. Thirteen years later he will explain the nature of God's working with like brevity: 'Sein handwerck ist aus bettler Herrn machen.' There is nothing startling about these examples; they are indeed among the ordinary and common features of Luther's style, and could be paralleled on almost every page of his writings.

These two things then condition the literary quality of all that the Reformer wrote: an unlimited potential vocabulary, and an imperious and practical principle in its selection. It may be objected that in certain measure these are features of sixteenth-century writing in general, and amount to little more than the popular method of writing used by Luther's contemporaries. They also were prepared to adopt any term that would put most forcibly the point at issue. Far from being a real objection, this leads us to the most urgent question that stands right at the outset of our enquiry, as to how Luther is to be differentiated from his fellow craftsmen. His own style can only be rightly distinguished from theirs if it be first admitted that they have considerable affinity. They, as he, are popular in tone, and hence catholic in appeal. His style has often their quality, and only when this has been recognised is one free to illustrate his superiority.

Consider these phrases of Karlstadt: 'Ob einer dorfft sagen: Ja ich bette die bilder nit an....Antwort gott kurtzlich und mit lichten worten...' or, 'Wann got auffgeht so fallen alle bildnis.' Or this quip from Hans Sachs: 'Ich habe nur von der Gemein ein Aufrur besorgt, sonst wolt ich im die Pantoffel in sein Antlitz geschmeisst haben, im hets Christus oder Paulus in dreien Tagen nicht abgewischt, wiewol er al sein Vertrauen auf sie setzt¹.'

Here are several things characteristic of Luther, his brevity, his careless mixture of what a later age would consider sacred and profane, his popular form of appeal. What is more, Luther has not the constant prerogative of these things. He can be involved, wordy and not eloquent,

¹ Karlstadt, *Von Abthuung der Bilder (Kleine Texte, 74)*, pp. 7, 10. Sachs, *Disputation zwischen einem Chorherren und Schuchmacher*, ed. Kinzel, p. 50.

vigorous and yet not clear or impressive, witness his open letter to the Pope, printed as preface to his most famous tract (II, 2, 3).

Reading this letter one may imagine oneself lost on a sea of sixteenth-century words, numerous and involved but neither convincing nor precise, faintly foreshadowing the word-forests of Fischart, but once the real argument begins this wordiness disappears. One finds such perfect sentence arrangement as this: 'Ist nu das nit ein froliche wirtschafft, da der reyche, edle, frummer breudgam Christus das arm vorachte böses hürlein zur ehe nimpt, und sie entledigt von allem ubel, zieret mit allen gutern.' Hardly more than thirty words, most of them of not more than two syllables, and expressing with such slender means two complete and impressive contrasts, that of the qualities of Christ and the soul, that of the double action of Christ upon the soul. Here is admittedly no shattering eloquence, but the author of this sentence is obviously a stylist, he knows how to draw an impressive picture with simple words, how to set a balance and contrast within his sentence that shall bring into relief all its positive statement.

A student of French literature will realise how great a part mere accumulation plays in sentence building in the sixteenth century. Luther is an admirable exponent of this feature of style, in some ways superior in his use of it to Rabelais. It is of course natural to an author who has much to say, and comes partly in Luther's case from a passionate absorption with and response to his religious message, from his conviction of a force that may permeate every corner of life, and needs therefore a flood of homely detail for its adequate description. Hence the lists of qualities and benefits of the soul in the *Freiheit* of which an example has just been given.

Luther's literary skill in the adaptation and arrangement of a list of epithets undoubtedly developed with the years. The early sermon of 1518 also quoted above has some elementary examples, thus, 'Wan es aber dahyn kumpt, das niemand yn deyner stad mehr ist d'hulff bedarff. . . dan saltu geben zu den kirchen, altern, schmuck, kilch, die ynn deyner stad seyn'; or again, ' . . dass hab ich schon oben gesagt, das meyn will, begirde, bitt und radt ist das niemand ablas losse' (I, 12, 13).

Obviously the epithets here are merely signs of a 'full' style, put down as they come into the mind of a rapid writer. In some cases even the list shows the writer's mind at work on the choice of a convenient image; he will mention one after another until he strikes the one most suited to his mood, and that only will be developed. In a sermon of 1519 he compares in one short sentence the sacrament of the Eucharist successively to a

fortress, bridge, door and ship, and this last image is developed into a picture of the last crossing of Jordan (I, 207). Artistic selection is undeniably present here, in a rough way, and it is one of the attractions of Luther's hasty writing, that one may watch such a gift seeking its fittest expression.

One of the interesting cases of his stylistic development occurs in his explanation of the Creed. In the first version of 1517 he writes. 'Ich traw bestendiglich ynn ihn, wie lang er vorzeugt, und setze yhm keyn zill, weyss, zeit und mass . . .' He was obviously conscious of the increased effect of an artistic ordering of these epithets, since five years later he remodelled the list thus: 'zill, zeyt, mass oder weysse,' by which he gets not merely alliteration but the extra syllable of rebound at the end. The perfect use of couples of epithets is found in the hymn on the Dutch martyrs, written in the latter part of 1523: 'Hie hilfft kein bach, loch, grub noch grab.' This cannot be really explained as intended or in any way conscious ordering. It is the intuitive progress of the true artist towards euphony and harmony. We shall find many other cases of his sensitiveness to the medium in which he works, the choice of words for their sound as much as for their logical meaning.

But Luther accumulates not merely single epithets in short groups. He often gives the sensation of life and movement by indicating in the briefest way several activities or qualities, and this proceeding is perhaps at the root of the artistic form of the famous Smaller Catechism:

Ich glaube, das mich Gott geschaffen hat sampt allen creaturn, mir leib und seel, augen, orn und alle gelieder, vernunft und alle synne gegeben hat und noch erhelt, dazu kleider und schuch, essen und trinken, haus und hofe, weib und kind, acker, vihe und alle guter, mit aller notturfft und narung dis leibs und lebens reichlich und teglich versorget, wider alle fergligkeit beschirmet und fur allem ubel behut und bewaret....

Readers unaccustomed to sixteenth-century style will be struck chiefly by the breathlessness of this sentence of which I quote slightly more than half. Luther like all his contemporaries relied on the very simplest means of sentence construction: completeness and wealth of expression were attained by adding together a descriptive list and stringing one to another all the various ideas that could be forced into the compass of one sentence. The more striking are the force and clarity and harmony that may result from even such rudimentary means as these were. Luther's list of nouns is neither oppressive nor dull; they are grouped for the most part in natural pairs, and separated by verbal constructions that lengthen out the phrasing and prevent monotony. How much for example does the whole sentence gain in elasticity from the amplification of the first two

main verbs: 'gegeben hat und noch erhelt...reichlich und teglich versorget'? It is perhaps worth note in passing that such rhythms as these have remained in intimate use up to the present day.

But there is more in this style than mere technical ability to group words and expressions according to a constant sense of alliteration or rhythm. Similar qualities are to be found in Luther's use of a very different medium. His Latin writings show in places the same breathless accumulation, the same instinctive grouping and alliterative sense. It was surely phrasing and temper rather than argument that made men read and reread such a famous sentence as this:

Surgite ergo hic universi adulescentes Papae in unum, satagite, defendite vos ab impietate, tyrannide, laesa maiestate Evangelii, iniuria fraterni opprobrii, qui haereticos iactatis eos qui non secundum merum capitis vestri somnium contra tam patentes et potentes scripturas sapiunt.

What was this something that made such tracts as the *Babylonian Captivity* spread beyond Germany and provoked from enthusiastic readers in foreign universities such a comment as this: 'Deus bone, quanto fervore scripta'?¹ This 'fervor' had little to do with mere skill in the use of words, and has usually been ascribed to a robust popular temperament. That the man of the people was very near to the surface in all that Luther wrote is proved by his variety of language and constant preference for the popular and concrete rather than the abstract expression. But this would not of itself make a great or an excellent style and critics have perhaps done less than justice to the artistic temperament that is hardly ever absent from his writing. To be fitly appreciated it calls for separate analysis, although it almost goes without saying that it is never found as a separate quality in Luther's work. The son of the Eisleben miner, the creator of the new High German language and the author of 'Ein feste burg' were all one man, and it is due to this triple contribution that the style is unique.

The artist in Luther finds expression in an infallible recourse to the dramatic or the picturesque, the visual in a word, in preference to the merely analytic or descriptive, the intellectual. He was a poet at least in this, that, being in no doubt as to the truth of what he said, he preferred to make that truth clear by picture rather than by argument. The picture is homely and the imagery rough, that is the man, but the use of the picture in abstract and spiritual discussion is proof of the artist.

Luther's battle-hymn just referred to has found many admirers, but their praise has on the whole been more emphatic than discriminating.

¹ See *La Réforme allemande*, p. 50.

Surely the distinctive thing about the hymn as a piece of literary expression is neither the courage behind it, nor even the vigour of the style, but the astonishing transformation (on the model certainly of the original Hebrew) of a spiritual exhortation into a picture of physical sense and colour. The spiritual content has not disappeared, but tends to express itself almost entirely in material metaphor:

Und wenn die welt voll teuffel wer, und wollt uns gar verschlingen,
 So furchten wir uns nicht zu sehr; es sol uns doch gelingen;
 Der Furst dieser welt, wie sauer er sich stellt,
 Thut er uns doch nicht; das macht er ist gericht,
 Ein wortlein kan yhn fellen.

This instinct towards the physical and the picturesque accounts for Luther's masterly use of personification in argument. He will interpolate a careful explanation with a sudden appeal to his reader. He knows the rhetorical effect of haranguing his enemy as if face to face with him. He has names for things that to most of us are concepts or states of mind, thus Herr Omnes already mentioned, Meister Kluglin, Frau Musica. His great enemy, the Pope, is in his pages an ogre in many forms and only less frequently met with than that greater enemy, the Evil One himself. Examples could be given to show the effect on popular Reformation literature and art of Luther's astonishingly vivid word-pictures of the devil, and it is surely an exaggeration to ascribe to his peasant upbringing what is obviously an excellent literary and artistic procedure.

Luther's popular devotional treatise is a curious medley of exhortation and sound sense, sprinkled with stories here and there, homely similes and a wealth of ordinary detail calculated to bring life and actuality into any theme. It is this last quality that explains the effect on people in differing social conditions, and is at the same time the best evidence of the writer's temperament. In the *Magnificat* of 1521 Mary is thus described:

Auch zu Nazareth ynn yhrer stadt ist sie nit d'ubirsten regenten, sondern eynis gemeinen Burgers tochter gewesen, auff wilche niemant gross gesehen noch acht gehabt. Und sie unter yhren nachpawrn und tochttern ein schlechts megdlin das des fihes und hauss gewart nit mehr gewesen denn itzt sein mag ein arm hawsz magt, die da thu was man sie ym hauss zu thun heisse (II, 138).

And the sermon on *Married Life* has still stronger proof of Luther's realism:

Nu sihe zu, wenn die kluge hure, die naturliche vernunft (wilcher die heyden gefolgt haben, da sie am klugsten seyn wolten) das eheliche leben ansihet, so rumpfft sie die naszen und spricht. Ach solt ich das kind wiegen, die windell waschen, bette machen, stanck riechen, die nacht wachen, seyns schreiens warten, seyn grindt und blattern heylen, darnach des weybs pflegen, sie erneeren, erbeytten, hie sorgen, da sorgen, hie thun da thun, das leyden und diss leyden, und was denn mehr unlust und muhe der ehestand lernet. Ey solt ich so gefangen seyn.... Was sagt aber der christ-

liche glaube hiezu? Er thutt seyn augen auff, und sihet alle diesze geringe unlustige verachte werk ym geyst an, un wirtt gewar das sie alle mit gottlichen wolgefallen, als mit dem kostlichsten golt und edell steyn getzirt sind... (II, 352).

In this extract indeed are almost all the qualities that make up the distinctive character of Luther's style: personification, realism, popular terms and physical description, artistic arrangement of word and phrase. This realism indeed coupled with the mastery of language to fit any subject can produce not merely emotional but onomatopoeic and essentially comic effects. This side of Luther's talent is as yet totally unexplored, and space allows here one or two slight examples only. A word may give the sensation: '...dass sie so sicher und fein *rips raps* kundten Messe halten', or more brilliantly in the same text: "Hie aber sind keine zeugen, sondern *eine eintzele person, welche im tuncckeln munkelt, und unter dem hutlin spelet und spricht* darnach sie habe es so und so getan, dem solle man gleuben und unser seligkeit drauff setzen. Nem, das gilt nicht lieber schwager, man wirds nicht gleuben und sols auch nicht gleuben' (IV, 253). Or again from the *Magnificat*: 'das seyn *eytell neussling und midlinge dienstknecht, und nit kinder*.'

These are but a few examples of the way in which Luther is apt to disconcert those who think to find in him the traditional monument of rough piety or the unvarnished reflections of a popular religious writer. They should disconcert, however, the sectarian enquirer alone; for the student of literature they are pure gain, as showing the necessity for a revised estimate that shall take in all sides of this supreme specimen of sixteenth-century psychology. Once we have ceased to look merely at the language or the piety we shall be on the road to forming a comprehensive literary estimate. It should not be assumed however that the religious figure recedes in proportion as one tries to distinguish the traits of a literary physiognomy. On the contrary, Luther the writer is not explained nor adequately summed up as an artistic temperament, expressing itself with all the devices afforded by a large and popular vocabulary. There is in this man not merely an artist and a man of the people but a prophet, and this is apt to call forth with greater frequency than the other two his most excellent literary resources. The fact is not really surprising. Luther wrote with no idea or intent of artistic effect; his sole aim was the communication of religious truth, in as living a way as possible to the writer, and this accounts for both the popularity of his methods and the obvious haste of his composition. It is the final proof of his unconscious and intuitive way of going to work that his greatest passages correspond to his moments of real religious feeling,

particularly to those times when he rises above polemic and is able clearly to apprehend the main religious issue that was (dimly felt perhaps) his real inducement to preach as to write. At such times his mastery of words is unequalled and his prose becomes real harmony because of a restraint that certainty seems to confer on the emotion behind the writing. Luther never gets nearer to true poetry, that is to the suggestion of things that cannot be uttered, than when he is dealing with some supreme interest of religion. If such moods and moments were more sustained, instead of lapsing into everyday argument and polemic, Luther would have been placed before now among the greatest writers of the world.

Since the popular works at any rate are almost exclusively occupied with one subject, it is not surprising that the themes which call forth real eloquence are few in number and easily recognisable. Two of them may serve as ample illustration here. A consequence or rather accompaniment of the conviction of the priesthood of all believers is that the Christian man is one might almost say two men in one. He is a member of society and of a particular class in this world and at the same time a member of a much greater society that has little or no dependence on this world, and this latter quite without regard to his earthly circumstances. The greater indeed the contrast between his earthly poverty and his eternal possessions, the more striking does the reality of those possessions appear. Luther constantly returns to the wonder of this contrast between the appearance and the inner reality; thus on the Sacrament in 1529:

Darumb leren wir allezeit, man solle die Sacrament und alle eusserlich ding, so Gott ordnet und einsetzet, nicht ansehen nach der groben eusserlichen larven, wie man die schalen von der nuss sihet, sondern wie gottes wort darein geschlossen ist. Denn also reden wir auch von Vater und mutter stand, und weltlicher oberkeit, wenn man die wil ansehen, wie sie nasen, augen, haut und haar, fleisch und bein haben, so sehen sie Turken und Heyden gleich, und mocht auch jemand zufaren und sprechen: Warumb solt ich mehr von diesem halten, denn von andern? Weil aber das gebot dazu kompt, Du solt vater und mutter ehren, so sehe ich ein andern man, geschmuckt und angezogen mit der maiestet und herlichkeit Gottes (iv, 81).

In a tract written about the same time as this extract Luther urges the need for sending children to school and for building more and better schools throughout the land. Christian people should look upon such provision as a priceless privilege instead of a civic duty. The schoolmaster's calling is one for which both he who is called, and the parents who persuade him to take it up, can never be too grateful.

Wenn du nu gleich ein konig werest, so soltestu doch dich nicht werd lassen dunken, das du deinen sun mit allem deinem gut dran gewagt. Zu solchem ampt und werck geben und zihen mochtest. Ist nicht hie dein pfennig oder erbeit, so du an solchen son anwendest allzu hoch geehret, alzu herrlich gesegnet, alzu kostlich angeleget, und

besser den kein konigreich noch keiserthum ist fur Gottes augen gerecht? Auf den knien solt einer solchen pfenning an der welt ende tragen, wenn er wuste, das er solte daselbs so herrlich und teurr angeleget werden. Und sihe, du hast es in deinem hause und in deinem schos, dar an du es so herrlich kanst anlegen (IV, 156)

It is the glory of religion that its working has been most powerful in humble conditions and with humble means, and Reformation teaching delighted to embroider this contrast, thus continuing unwittingly the medieval tradition. We have seen how Luther comments upon the Magnificat. Calvin has similar passages but none so finished in their delicate simplicity as certain lines of Luther's hymns, which represent perhaps the ultimate achievement of the century in poetic expression.

Again one cannot quote at length because the form of these poems, like that of the prose, is astonishingly uneven. Effects of rhythm and epigram and harmony are attained almost by chance; there is no artistic intention present to preserve and prolong them. Only on occasion do the short jogging lines seem to expand through sheer felicity of expression and allow this circumscribed medium to suggest real beauty. Thus, without comment:

Es ward ein kleyne milch sein speysz, der nie keyn vöghn hungern liesz.

Or again:

Der sammet und die seiden dein, das ist grob hew und windelein.

The decisive example of Luther's inspiration, and the proof of the way in which an eternal human theme calls forth all his unconscious resources of expression and order, must be his treatment of the frailty of the moral life. It is nothing less than astonishing that in a tract as 'unbedacht' from the point of view of style and form as any he wrote, the popular justification of the articles condemned by Papal bull in 1520, we find such sentences as these:

Des menschen geist ist umlagert, und mit des teuffels anfechtung umgeben, mag schwerlich allen stucken begegnen, schwerlich allen widderstahn, ist der geitz niderdruckt, so stet auff die unkeuscheyt, ist die unkeuscheyt nidergeschlagen, so folget die eytel ehre, wirt die eytel ehre voracht, so erbittert sich der zorn, blist sich auf die hoffart, ficht an die trunckenheyt, der hasz zu reisset die eyngkeytt, das eyvern zurtheilet die fruntschafft. Hie mustu fluchen, das got vorpotten hat, hie mustu schweren das doch nit zimet. Szo manchfeltig vorfolgung musz leiden der geist des menschen, szo viel ferlichkeit musz das hertz gewartten, und unsz solt noch lusten hie unter solchenn schwerten des teuffels lange stehen? Szo viel mehr zu wunschen und zu bitten ist, das durch eilende hilf des tods, wyr zu Christo mochten bald kommen (II, 73).

At the risk of being importunate it is perhaps worth while to remark in detail on the way in which these lines instance almost every quality we have so far noted as characteristic of Luther's manner of writing. The inspiration is here, as so often, fragmentary. I have copied the end of

the passage expressly to show a final sentence that is competently expressed but which cannot be termed rhythmical. The rhythms of the opening phrases on the other hand are so perfect as to approach the regular stresses of verse. The first lines are naturally read as verse is scanned, with a regular admixture of Iambs and Anapaests. Not even Bossuet could show a succession of phrases with equal number of main stresses and an almost equal number of minor stresses as these:

Des ménschen geíst ist umblágerť,
und mit des teúffels anféchtung umbgében,
mag schwérlich allen stúcken begégnen,
schwérlich állen widerstáhn.

These are, let us note, the rhythms of which the German language of Luther's time was most easily capable, the quantity of monosyllables making any longer groups of words impossible. They are the stresses that have made his translation of the Bible a masterpiece. Compare with the above:

Der Hérr ist mein Hírte,
Mír wird nichts mángeln.

Our passage is surely proof that sustained rhythms are not to be sought exclusively in Luther's Bible. It will be noted that the fourth group of stresses scanned above adds very little to the sense of the sentence, and is found as an integral part of it surely for euphonic reasons, yet one more instance of a sense of form (very likely unconscious and that Luther would certainly have scorned to avow) present and active in his literary composition.

It may be objected that the regular stresses are not worth much attention, since they do not extend beyond the first four phrases of the passage. Any deficiency in quantity, however, cannot be said really to affect the quality inherent in them, and the objection further ignores the fact that although they cease, as one would expect in a passage where literary effect is not the sole aim, they are replaced by others, more elastic but hardly less expressive. There is no need to point out in detail that the remainder of the first complete sentence is composed of five pairs of complementary statements, of more or less the same syllable length, the last two more self-contained than the rest. The balance of the short sentence that follows is no less remarkable.

The artistic quality of the whole is seen surely in the renunciation of those kinds of effect so often employed in shorter passages and single sentences. Alliterations for example, high-sounding repetition or pictorial amplification of the images suggested, have no place here, because the writer, on the internal evidence of his words and their arrangement, is

aiming intuitively at a result very different from that which such artifice would give him. They increase vigour and sensation; these phrases produce an effect of cumulative harmonious progression, which is precisely the effect most calculated to strengthen and support the significance of the whole as an item in an intellectual presentation.

Are we not then justified in supposing that a minute analysis of the detail and elements of Luther's literary composition would lead to far-reaching conclusions as to the personality and artistic activity of the writer?¹ If in one example there seems reason to imagine both argument and conviction being accompanied by, and even finding their only adequate expression through, an artistic handling of words and sounds, is it extravagant to think that if scholars get to work on such cases, they may not merely bring us nearer to the solution of particular problems connected with Luther and the conflict of religion and literature in his century, but give us a firmer understanding of literary values in every age?

W. G. MOORE.

OXFORD.

¹ An admirable beginning in this field of enquiry has been made by Hans Preusz, *Martin Luther, der Künstler*, Gutersloh, 1931. See especially pp. 165 ff. for analyses and examples in many cases more detailed than those I have been able to give above.

MOLIÈRE AND LA MOTHE LE VAYER¹

I.

Un bel esprit, La Mothe Le Vayer, a dit . 'L'on peut dérober à la façon des abeilles sans faire tort à personne; mais le vol de la fourmi, qui enlève le grain entier, ne doit jamais être imité.' La Mothe Le Vayer avait un illustre ami qui pensait comme lui et faisait comme l'abeille. C'est Molière. Ce grand homme a pris à tout le monde. Aux modernes comme aux anciens, aux Latins, aux Espagnols, aux Italiens et même aux Français².

Did it occur to Anatole France when writing these lines that he might have added: 'et même à La Mothe Le Vayer'³? If anyone in the present century was familiar with the work of this seventeenth-century scholar, it must, we feel, have been the creator of Monsieur Jérôme Coignard. The opinions of the latter and in general those of Anatole France bear too close a resemblance to the opinions of 'Orasius Tubero' (as Le Vayer used to call himself) for us to doubt it. And often, as he turned over the pages of the old sceptic, pages where the most penetrating remarks and the suavest observations stand out like white-winged ships on an ocean of learning, he must have found passages which reminded him of scenes in Molière or ideas which the latter was to make his own, by the excellence of his style.

Are we to believe that Molière did in fact forage for ideas among the writings of his friend the seventeenth-century sceptic, the ponderous and erudite Le Vayer? More than this, that he took over from the latter his whole attitude towards life and morals and religion, rather than, as is so often asserted, from Gassendi the Epicurean? The possibility has in fact occurred to one or two critics³; our present aim is to explore a question which has hitherto been entirely neglected or at most passed over with hesitation.

The researches of M. Kerviler⁴, and more recently those of M. Emile Magne⁵, have demonstrated that Molière was well acquainted with La

¹ I have pleasure in expressing my sense of obligation to Professor O. H. Prior for directing my attention to a thinker who has never been adequately studied.

² A. France, *La Vie littéraire*, 4e série, in *Œuvres*, ed. Calmann-Lévy, 1926, VII, p. 535.

³ To M. Ernest Tisserand, notably. In his Introduction to the *Deux Dialogues de La Mothe Le Vayer* which he edited in 1922, M. Tisserand referred to the possibility that Molière's plays, after his return to Paris, followed the general trend of Le Vayer's thought, and that *Le Musanthrope* in particular owed its first inspiration to the *Prose chagrine*. He concludes: 'La Mothe Le Vayer, le grand humaniste, fut un des philosophes les plus intelligents de son temps. Nous nous plaisons à imaginer et nous espérons qu'il sera un jour démontré que le génie le plus humain qui parut jamais en aucun siècle ne dédaigna pas de l'écouter' (*Deux Dialogues faits à l'imitation des Anciens*, éd. par E. Tisserand, Paris, 1922, pp. 36, 37). See also Emile Magne, *Une Amie inconnue de Molière*, Paris, 1922, pp. 58 f.

⁴ R. Kerviler, *François de La Mothe Le Vayer*, Paris, 1879.

⁵ I am indebted to M. Magne for most of the *biographical* details that follow in this section.

Mothe Le Vayer and his family. We may picture after them the old magistrate, with his silver hair barely concealed under a tight-fitting skull-cap; and who with his thin lips and sharp features wore an expression of asceticism which seemed to belie the taste for licentious detail that appears in his works. Dressed in the manner of a gentleman of a former age, he would often wander through the streets, staring at the shop-signs or the upper stories of the houses, his grave and singular demeanour giving the impression that he was an astrologer or, at the least, a Calvinist pastor¹. But generally he was to be found in his home, perusing anew the Greek and Roman philosophers, browsing in Pomponazzi and Charron, and reading all the latest books of travel, geography or science; at intervals he would break out into a fit of vile ill-temper when his family would scarcely dare approach him; or he would annoy them by other means, such as making himself a spectacle by rubbing tallow on his face; his visitors, however, would go away charmed with the varied, curious, and witty information with which he would entertain them, and of which he had a veritable mine. It may be assumed that, of all the originals who swarmed in the Paris of Louis XIII, La Mothe Le Vayer was among the most fantastic. And yet, this queer and uncertain-tempered old man was universally respected. For many years he had been a member of the Academy. The great Richelieu had of old commissioned him to write pamphlets and indeed a treatise against his adversaries. As a former tutor of the Duke of Anjou and of the King himself, he held a privileged position at court. A leader, almost a patron, of the free-thinkers, and a declared Pyrrhonist who had openly preached his doctrines, he nevertheless enjoyed an immunity from interference extended to none of his contemporaries, not even to Molière.

For some years La Mothe Le Vayer and his family had lived in the rue des Bons-Enfants, a few yards from the Palais-Royal, in a quarter occupied by members of the aristocracy and the civil service; in 1656 he moved into the neighbouring parish of Saint-Roch, taking a house in the rue Traversière, where he had among his acquaintance several of those free-thinkers and gossips he so loved to entertain. Here he lived with his son the Abbé Le Vayer, a young priest with an enthusiasm for sceptical philosophy; and his late wife's² niece, Honorée de Bussy, a charming and clever girl³ devoted to him and to his son. This brilliant and witty *ménage* enjoyed considerable notoriety; and it was natural that when Molière,

¹ Tallemant des Réaux, *Historiettes*, ed. 1854, I, p. 433; III, p. 265.

² Madame Le Vayer, a daughter of Adam Blackwood of Dunfermline, had died in 1655.

³ For Honorée de Bussy, see E. Magne, *Une Amie inconnue de Molière*.

returning to the capital in 1658, took up his quarters a few hundred yards away in the rue Saint-Thomas du Louvre, which formerly (for it has now disappeared) ran from the Palais-Royal to the river, he should speedily make acquaintance with the household. La Mothe Le Vayer may have met Molière at court; or Chapelle may have taken him to the house¹; the likeliest suggestion is that he was introduced by the Abbé Le Vayer who, despite his ecclesiastical habit and philosophic turn of mind, had a passion for the stage. More than once Molière was to find him paying his court to the actresses; and one may well imagine that this gay Lothario would seize the first opportunity of entertaining the actor-playwright whose star was now in the ascendant.

However that may be, it was not long before Molière found himself a member of the circle that gathered round La Mothe Le Vayer, or again round Madame de la Sablière. And here a friendship rapidly sprang up between himself and the philosopher's son and niece. Honorée de Bussy, who kept house for her uncle, was one of those young girls whom Molière liked to depict from time to time; moderate and reasonable in outlook, domesticated, cultured without affectation—a kind of Henriette, she fulfilled the idea he always had of 'la juste nature.' In the years that followed, she became Molière's principal counsellor and critic; it was to her that he read his plays² before circulating the parts for rehearsal. He came so to rely on her taste, formed in court circles, that she was able, as M. Magne suggests, not only to correct or confirm the truth of his characters, but possibly to amplify them³ or even to furnish new ones. And if at any time there was doubt as to the success of an experiment, as happened in *L'Avare*, it was her opinion that Molière trusted; in this instance, it was her support that sustained him after the failure of the first performance⁴.

For her cousin the Abbé, with his foibles and enthusiasms, the dramatist conceived a whimsical affection which deepened with the years. The preposterous inconsistencies in the young man's character appealed to Molière's sense of humour: here was one of those naive but noble beings who had to be protected against the world and against himself. There was a certain piquancy about an Abbé who, as chaplain to Mademoiselle, might yet be surprised flirting with one of Molière's actresses, whispering gallantries by turn into the ear of the sentimental De Brie or the charming Du Parc. It was hardly less piquant to receive, as a delicate gift from

¹ Magne, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

² Tallemant des Réaux, *op. cit.*, II, p. 200.

³ Magne, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-2.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 72-3.

this curious character, the collected works of his father the old sceptic, La Mothe Le Vayer, piously edited in two large folio volumes by the Abbé himself. The good young Abbé had indeed imbibed the principles of Pyrrhonism from his earliest years, and to him it was doubtless the most natural and reasonable of systems; with his father he would have felt that there is no kind of philosophising 'qui s'accommode avec notre foi et qui donne tant de repos à une âme chrétienne que fait notre chère Sceptique¹'; further, that 'la Sceptique se peut nommer une parfaite introduction au Christianisme².' When, in his rare moments of leisure, the dramatist would peruse these curious pages in which erudition was mingled with so much of savoury gossip, and the most daring and indiscreet speculations jostled the conclusions of the gravest philosophy, he would often smile to himself while reflecting that here was incomparably the richest arsenal for the free-thinker which had appeared since the *Essays* of Montaigne and the works of Charron.

II. 'PROSE CHAGRINE.'

Molière, then, was well acquainted with Le Vayer himself, and must certainly have had some knowledge of his works. Did he draw upon them for ideas? did he indeed take his whole philosophy from them? This is the question, one of acute importance, whose solution is likely to overthrow all the accepted views of Molière's sources. Now it is a general principle that when studying the art of a creative genius, such as was Molière's, it is an impossible task to prove absolutely that he derived his ideas from one source or another, unless there can be discovered close parallels in language and in style, as well as in thought.

In the year 1665, La Mothe Le Vayer was already an old man and a cantankerous one. We have the record of him on one occasion seizing a glowing log that annoyed him on the fire, flinging it out into the room, and spending the remnant of his ill-tempered energy on stamping it out. One of his peculiar habits was to smear tallow over his face (as previously mentioned) before going to bed. This operation he might even perform before sitting down to supper with his niece and son. His wife had told him flatly on one occasion that the only philosophical thing about him was his boots³, which were indeed loose-fitting and comfortable. This ill-humour of his was no doubt aggravated by the loss of his son in 1664; but it had already found expression even earlier than this,

¹ *Dialogue sur la Diversité des Religions*, in *Cinq Dialogues faits à l'imitation des Anciens* [1630], Liège, 1673, p. 333.

² *Ibid.*, p. 335.

³ Tallemant des Réaux gives these details. *Historiettes*, ed. cit., II, p. 55.

in 1661, the year of the *Prose chagrine*, a book which remains one of the most curious personal confessions that the seventeenth century has bequeathed to us¹.

It was in fact as an outlet for his vexation of spirit that the philosopher took up his pen. 'Le chagrin, qui me possède présentement, m'envoie au cerveau des fumées si contraires à toute conversation, que pour aucunement les dissiper...il faut que je m'en décharge sur ce papier².' So he writes in 1661; it is the complaint of one disgusted with the ills inseparable from human life; the education which produces pedants and fools; our ethics which offer us no security, since we cannot distinguish vice from virtue; the abuses of the age; the intrigues which prevail in every walk of life; the disorders in the Church; the ruinous costs of litigation; the roguery of 'traitants' and 'maltôtiers,' and so on. A meeting with a stubborn and argumentative dogmatist launches him on a long exposition and defence of Christian Pyrrhonism; from this he passes on to 'little sceptical observations' on the relativity of morals, customs and beliefs; and concludes with an unexpectedly moderate diatribe against doctors of medicine, in which, however, he allows that there is something to be said in their favour.

We may imagine Molière, dispirited at this time by ill-health and anxiety, glancing through these pages and asking himself whether an excellent comedy could not be written on such a 'philosophe chagrin' as here revealed himself: such a character as this La Mothe Le Vayer, or rather such as he might have been, had he not found escape from his black moods in the consolations of scepticism.

The *Prose chagrine* opens with the admission by La Mothe Le Vayer that he is disposed to solitude; like Orpheus, he prefers 'the company of wild beasts to that of men.' '[Le lieu] où je me trouve est tel que d'y rencontrer un homme véritablement vertueux, ce n'est pas une moindre merveille que de trouver une source d'eau douce...au milieu de la mer³.' This moral solitude, then, serves to feed his misanthropy. The coincidence with a similar passage in *Le Misanthrope* is striking:

...je hais tous les hommes
Les uns parce qu'ils sont méchants et malfaisants,
Et les autres pour être aux méchants complaisants....
Et parfois il me prend des mouvements soudains
De fuir dans un désert l'approche des humains⁴.

At this point in his reflections, Le Vayer goes on to exclaim: 'Mais de

¹ See *Œuvres*, ed. 1662, 2 vols., II, pp. 1105-45.

² *Ibid.*, p. 1105.

³ *Prose chagrine*, Livre premier, *Œuvres*, ed. cit., II, p. 1110.

⁴ *Misanthrope*, Act I, sc. i.

quelle *bizarrierie* n'est point capable l'humeur *chagrine* où je suis!¹' Similarly Molière enumerates the quaint outbursts and strange imprudences of which Alceste's ill-humour was capable.

Philinte. Mais encor, dites-moi quelle *bizarrierie*...?

Alceste. Laissez-moi là, vous dis-je, et courez vous cacher

Philinte. Mais on entend les gens au moins sans se fâcher.

Alceste. Moi, je veux me fâcher et ne veux point entendre.

Philinte. Dans vos brusques *chagrins* je ne puis vous comprendre².

But Alceste will not be calmed. He settles himself down obstinately into his ill-humour:

J'entre en une humeur noire, en un chagrin profond,
Quand je vois vivre entre eux les hommes comme ils font;
Je ne trouve partout que lâche flatterie,
Qu'injustice, intérêt, trahison, fourberie.
Je n'y puis plus tenir, j'enrage...³.

And this reminds us of Le Vayer's outburst:

D'où vient que le chagrin me fait aujourd'hui trouver à redire presque à tout, et qu'il se passe peu de choses soit dans l'ordre Ecclésiastique, soit dans celui de la Justice, soit encore dans celui des Finances, où je ne trouve beaucoup à reprendre⁴?

Alceste, then, attacks the vices of the age as La Mothe Le Vayer had attacked them. We may suppose that, in drawing the character of his hero, Molière had more than one model in view: the gruff and downright Montausier may have furnished the prototype; but it is not impossible that certain traits were provided by the old philosopher of the rue Traversière. It is perhaps significant that Alceste's misanthropy is described as 'ce chagrin *philosophe*'; just as Philinte is represented as a philosopher of another creed, when he declares:

Et je crois qu'à la cour, de même qu'à la ville,
Mon flegme est philosophe autant que votre bile.

Sometimes, in his *Prose chagrine*, Le Vayer pauses and in the manner of the sceptic presents the other side of the question. Even in his blackest moods, he seeks that 'suspension d'esprit' and that sceptical ataraxy, which will restore tranquillity to his mind. Now not only is the clash between two extremes eminently 'plaisant,' but to maintain the balance between them is in the very essence of the comic spirit; and this habit of the old sceptic finds its counterpart in the interplay of character between Alceste and Philinte. We may go further, and say that when Philinte defends the usages of society and recommends an attitude of good-humoured tolerance, he is repeating, in words more lively and more memorable, the advice that Le Vayer himself had given in one of those

¹ *Prose chagrine*, ed. cit., p. 1110.

² *Misanthropie*, Act I, sc. i.

⁴ *Prose chagrine*, ed. cit., p. 1114.

³ *Ibid.*

innumerable *Petits traités ou Lettres* which may have caught Molière's eye:

Il semble qu'on pourrait soutenir [we read in Letter C. *De la vaine présomption*] qu'il est comme impossible à ceux qui voient toutes les sottes vanités du grand monde, d'être assez retenus pour n'user contre elles d'aucune invective. Mais je ne suis pas de cet avis [It is better to] laisser faire les autres comme ils l'entendent.... Outre qu'il y a beaucoup de témérité pour un particulier de vouloir réformer le monde, il lui est si aisé de se taire....

We might be listening to Philinte:

Ma foi, vous ferez bien de garder le silence.

For, says La Mothe Le Vayer:

le silence fournit tant d'agréables entretiens à ceux qui en savent bien user, qu'il n'y a guère que les inconsiderés [like Alceste] qui le rompent pour dire des vérités importunes, outre qu'elles sont presque toujours inutiles ..,

exactly as Philinte tells his friend:

Non, tout de bon, quittez toutes ces incartades.
Le monde par vos soins ne se changera pas.

Vous ne prendrez donc pas [we resume the quotation from Le Vayer's *petit traité*] pour une démangeaison d'écrire, ni pour un dessein formé de censurer personne, ce que vous aurez ici de moi...¹.

Everyone will recognise here the expression which Alceste himself is to use when warning Oronte:

Qu'il faut qu'un galant homme ait toujours grand empire
Sur les *démangeaisons* qui nous prennent d'écrire².

If La Mothe Le Vayer provided Molière with a few traits for his 'philosophe chagrin,' it does not follow that Alceste had anything of the sceptic about him. It is part of the humour of his character that he is not even a misanthrope. He has not stripped himself of any of those sentiments of compassion, annoyance, or indignation, which Pyrrho regarded as so inimical to philosophic detachment. On the contrary, Alceste would be as ready to help a friend in distress as he is to break out in imprecations on human turpitude. He is as far as possible from attaining the 'aphasia' and 'metriopatheia' which are among the prime virtues of the sceptic. It is not in Alceste that we must look for any signs of Pyrrhonism, but, as we shall see, in Philinte, and in Molière himself.

The more one reflects upon the two books of the *Prose chagrine*, the more one realises that they are among those unassuming works of rich and deep humanity of which the great seventeenth-century writers had the secret. This is not the place to analyse a book which the writer hopes

¹ *De la vaine présomption*. *Œuvres*, ed. cit., II, p. 840.

² *Misanthrope*, Act II, sc. ii.

to study elsewhere in detail. The *Prose chagrine* is perhaps richer in content than any other of its author's works; it is not exactly his swan-song; but it is the book into which, when disappointments had jolted the old man out of his equanimity, he put most of himself. It is the work of a philosopher, but more particularly of a moralist; there are echoes of it at the very least, though it might be temerity to say there is more, in the majority of Molière's plays.

Les Femmes savantes is probably the most harmonious expression of the comic genius which exists; and yet it may be plausibly argued that the central idea of this masterpiece of Molière's is contained in a page of the *Prose chagrine*—that in which Le Vayer censures, in terms very like Molière's, the possession of learning without balance or judgment:

Pour moi je remarque tous les jours tant de fous lettrés, et cette *stultitia literata* me paraît si importune partout, qu'elle me donne un dégoût de la Science, qui n'est pas une des moindres causes de mon chagrin. L'on peut voir d'un œil indifférent des hommes sans lettres; mais il est impossible de considérer sans indignation des lettres sans homme [Trissotin]. Si l'on accuse mon humeur austère de favoriser l'ignorance [as Clitandre will be accused], j'avouerai franchement que je préfère en beaucoup de façons un modeste ignorant à un vain et présomptueux savant¹. Ce n'est pas que je ne sache bien ce qu'on a dit il y a si longtemps, que c'est fort mal remédier aux défauts dont nous parlons, d'avoir recours à l'ignorance....Mais pourquoi accuserons-nous d'une honteuse ignorance, ceux à qui la Nature a donné un excellent sens commun?² [Martine].

This page, it will be seen, reappears in a dramatised form in that brilliant third scene of Act IV, in which Clitandre holds his own against Trissotin, Philaminte and Armande. Clitandre, says Philaminte,

. . . fait profession de chérir l'ignorance,
Et de haïr surtout l'esprit et la science.
Clitandre. Cette vérité veut quelque adoucissement.
Je m'explique, madame, et je hais seulement
La science et l'esprit qui gâtent les personnes.
Trissotin. J'ai cru jusques ici que c'était l'ignorance
Qui faisait les grands sots, et non pas la science.
Clitandre. Vous avez cru fort mal, et je vous suis garant
Qu'un sot savant est sot plus qu'un sot ignorant.

And a little further on he inveighs courageously against the pedants,

Riches, pour tout mérite, en babil importun,
Inhabiles à tout, vides de sens commun,
Et pleins d'un ridicule et d'une impertinence
À décrier partout l'esprit et la Science.

In a century when erudition, cultivated for its own sake, was still widespread among the educated classes, pedantry was a vice into which the wariest were apt to fall. As early as 1631, in the *Dialogue sur l'Opiniâ-*

¹ Cf. in the portrait of Trissotin, 'La constante hauteur de sa présomption' (I, III).

² *Prose chagrine*, Livre I, ed. cit., II, p. 1108.

treté, Ephestion (*La Mothe Le Vayer*) had spoken of *Cratès* (*Vaugelas*) in the following terms: 'Vous connaissez l'humeur du personnage, et savez combien avantageusement et absolument il veut tout ce qu'il veut¹.' We at once recognise the conceited dogmatist whom *Clitandre* describes to *Henriette*:

Je vis dans le fatras des écrits qu'il nous donne
Ce qu'étaie en tous lieux sa pédante personne,
La constante hauteur de sa présomption,
Cette intrépidité de bonne opinion...².

The figure of the pedant was, of course, as well known to Molière as to *Le Vayer*, and he had no need to come to these pages in order to find it. But should *La Mothe Le Vayer* prove to be the indubitable source of his ideas, we have not the less, but the more to marvel, that from these rambling dialogues and dissertations, bristling with Greek and Latin, and with their harsh and acrid flavour, he has distilled no bitter therapeutic, but a honey sweet as it is wholesome.

III. MOLIERE AND THE PHYSICIANS.

No social type appealed to Molière's sense of humour more often, or with more devastating effect, than the doctor of medicine. The portrait of the 'death-dealing physician' has been painted in lurid colours by Paul de Saint-Victor; and doubtless, inspired by his native verve, the author of *Les deux Masques* has drawn a caricature rather than a picture. The 'sable flock of apothecaries and doctors' was probably less murderous than we might conclude. Doubtless, however, Molière was justified in regarding them as fit subjects for the satirist's lash; and from 1665 onwards he brought them again and again before the footlights.

Certainly, he and his contemporaries had many grounds for complaint. The Faculty of Medicine was still hidebound by formalities and traditions. It was better for a man to die according to the rules than to live in defiance of them³. For, as *Monsieur Tomès* remarks: 'Un homme mort n'est qu'un homme mort, et ne fait point de conséquence; mais une formalité négligée porte un notable préjudice à tout le corps des médecins⁴.' These gibes of Molière were not without foundation; but his principal case against the doctors was that, while grossly ignorant of the human body and its ailments, they insisted on prescribing violent remedies in

¹ *Dialogue sur l'Opiniâtreté*, ed. Tisserand, 1922, p. 159. We may add that Molière, like *Le Vayer*, seems to have had no great enthusiasm for *Vaugelas*.

² *Femmes savantes*, Act I, sc. iii.

³ *L'Amour médecin*, Act III, sc. v, and cf. *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, Act I, sc. vi.

⁴ *L'Amour médecin*, Act II, sc. iii.

season and out of season. And how well one knew what their prescriptions would be:

Clisterium donare,
Postea seignare,
Ensutta purgare¹.

Especially 'seignare.' There were doctors who had a veritable rage for bleeding their patients. Even when innovations were tried, such bitter controversies arose among the doctors that the whole city was scandalised. The latest cure for fever was antimony, or emetic wine: it had been tried on Louis XIV at Calais in 1658; the King, who was abnormally robust, had recovered, and emetic wine had forthwith become a fashionable remedy².

In his attacks on the medical profession Molière was pretty sure that the public would support him. La Mothe Le Vayer, for his part, was not disposed to go so far. He appreciated the great difficulties in the way of medical science, and, besides, some of his dearest friends, Gabriel Naudé, Samuel Sorbière and Gui Patin, were doctors. But even he, in spite of this strong consideration, was impelled to aim from time to time a satiric shaft at the physicians; there are several passages in his writings, between 1640 and 1661, from which the author of *Le Malade imaginaire* may well have drawn inspiration. Molière, however, had strong personal reasons for attacking the medical profession; moreover, it was actually his acquaintance with La Mothe Le Vayer's family that gave him the first bitter occasion for his onslaught.

For some years now Molière had been on the friendliest terms with the Abbé Le Vayer. Everyone has heard of the famous 'Société des Quatre' and has imagined the four, Boileau, Molière, Racine and La Fontaine, planning the regeneration of French Literature over friendly bottles of wine at the 'Pomme de pin' or the 'Croix de Lorraine.' Alas for literary legends! The 'Club des Quatre' ought to have existed, but it did not. Racine and La Fontaine were certainly acquainted with Molière; there is, however, no contemporary evidence to show that they, with Molière and Boileau, formed a closely united group; and in fact no mention of it occurs before the eighteenth century. We leave debatable ground when we turn to Molière's friendship with the Abbé Le Vayer. He and Molière were genuinely bound by ties of affectionate intimacy; that the former was worthy of this affection is evident from the fact that even the surly Boileau, who was drawn into the circle, unbent so far as to dedicate his fourth satire to the young Abbé, a rare mark of esteem. The object of

¹ *Malade imaginaire*, 3e intermède.

² See A. Tilley, *Molière*, 1921, pp. 266f.

their friendship was undoubtedly a man of personality; he had produced a realistic novel, *Le Parasite Mormon*, and a translation of Florus, which are well spoken of for the times. He was the cheeriest and best informed of companions; high hopes were entertained for his future. We can, therefore, imagine the grief of his friends when in September, 1664, he fell sick of a fever. The three doctors who were called in seem to have been helpless in treating the malady. One of them at least, André Esprit, was trying to break away from the traditional prescriptions which Molière ridicules, and to discover new methods of treatment; but these methods could only be tested by experience, and his experiments were apt to cost a terrible price. In the past, indeed, he had been unusually successful¹; but in the case of the Abbé Le Vayer he and his colleagues could think only of antimony, and three doses of it proved too much for their patient.

La Mothe Le Vayer was more stricken by the loss than he would admit. From Molière he received a letter of heartfelt condolence, and with it a poem in sonnet form such as a greater man than he might have been proud of receiving:

Vous voyez, Monsieur [wrote Molière], que je m'écarte fort du chemin qu'on suit d'ordinaire en pareille rencontre, et que le sonnet que je vous envoie n'est rien moins qu'une consolation. Mais j'ai cru qu'il fallait en user de la sorte avec vous, et que c'est consoler un philosophe que de lui justifier ses larmes....Si je n'ai pas trouvé d'assez fortes raisons pour affranchir votre tendresse des sévères leçons de la philosophie, et pour vous obliger à pleurer sans contrainte, il en faut accuser le peu d'éloquence d'un homme qui ne saurait persuader ce qu'il sait si bien faire. Molière.

The sonnet ran as follows:

Aux larmes, Le Vayer, laisse tes yeux ouverts:
 Ton deuil est raisonnable, encor qu'il soit extrême;
 Et lorsque pour toujours on perd ce que tu perds,
 La Sagesse, crois-moi, peut pleurer elle-même.
 On se propose à tort cent préceptes divers
 Pour vouloir, d'un ceil sec, voir mourir ce qu'on aime;
 L'effet en est barbare aux yeux de l'univers,
 Et c'est brutalité plus que vertu suprême.
 Je sais bien que les pleurs ne ramèneront pas
 Ce cher fils que t'enlève un imprévu trépas;
 Mais la perte par là n'en est pas moins cruelle.
 Ses vertus de chacun le faisaient révéler;
 Il avait le cœur grand, l'esprit beau, l'âme belle,
 Et ce sont des sujets à toujours le pleurer².

With the Abbé Le Vayer perished a genuine talent and a rare friend. His loss left a blank in Molière's life which nothing came to fill. Racine, with whom he became acquainted about this time, was a man of genius,

¹ E. Magne, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-9.

² The letter and sonnet have been preserved among Conrart's papers in the Library of the Arsenal. They are reprinted by Kerviler, *op. cit.*, pp. 169 and 170.

but, as Molière was soon to find, untrustworthy and disloyal. Boileau could always be relied on, but he was too prosaic and too carping to be a perfect companion. There were indeed Bernier and Chapelle—Chapelle especially, who was as good as three ordinary friends: brimming over with ideas, the soul of gaiety and wit. It was he who, when they ate together at the 'Croix de Lorraine,' cheered Molière by his sallies and drew him out of the fits of moodiness to which he was subject. But there were many times like the present one, when Molière could only sink back into solitude and sad meditation.

He had reason enough for his pessimism. The King had been compelled to forbid the public production of *Tartuffe*, and the 'Troupe de Monsieur,' unprovided with suitable plays, found its receipts falling very low. In the following February (1665) *Don Juan* met with a popular success; but so vigorous was the campaign waged against it by the 'Cabale des Dévots' that Molière was obliged to withdraw the play after it had been running for a month. And by the end of the year his company would have been in a sorry plight, if the King had not come to its assistance. Molière, in the meantime, had not forgotten the doctors. He had already opened his attack on them in *Don Juan*, where he makes his hero declare that 'tout leur art est pure grimace.' And when Louis XIV asked him to produce a *comédie-ballet* before the court at five days' notice, he immediately thought of the physicians, and it was they whom he made his butt in *L'Amour médecin* (September, 1665). Each of the four doctors summoned to consult on the case of Lucinde represents a well-known figure of the time, though it is difficult to assign all the parts with certainty¹. We can, however, be fairly sure that André Esprit is caricatured in the person of Monsieur Bahis. This doctor is described as stammering; his name, from βαύζω, appears to mean the 'barker,' an allusion to the jerky utterance of the physician to the Duke of Orleans². It is he who, after Macroton has prescribed a mild remedy, is made to say: 'Après nous en viendrons à la purgation et à la saignée, que nous réitérerons s'il en est besoin'; and to add: 'Il vaut mieux mourir selon les règles que de rechapper contre les règles³.'

Molière had not forgiven Dr Esprit; nor had he forgiven him when he wrote *Le Médecin malgré lui* (September, 1666): for, although no 'real' physician is brought on to the stage, the caricature is more cutting, and the allusions to the case of the Abbé Le Vayer more direct. When the

¹ Except that Macroton represents Guénaut, famous in Paris as the first doctor to give up a mule for a horse (Tilley, *op. cit.*, p. 269).

² *Ibid.*, p. 268.

³ Act II, sc. v.

peasant Thibaut is explaining his wife's malady to Sganarelle, he says that the apothecary had wanted to give her 'du vin amétile; mais j'ai-z-eu peur franchement que ça l'envoyât à patres, et l'an dit que ces gros médecins tuont je ne sais combien de monde avec cette invention-là'¹—an obvious reference to the emetic wine administered to the Abbé. And if there is nothing quite so amusing as the happy recovery of the cat which fell from the house-top², we have on the other hand Sganarelle's explanation to Léandre of the advantages of exercising the medical profession, on the ground that 'ici l'on peut gâter un homme sans qu'il en coûte rien. .. Enfin le bon de cette profession est qu'il y a parmi les morts une honnêteté, une discrétion la plus grande du monde, et jamais on n'en voit se plandre du médecin qui l'a tué'³—a pleasantry common enough in one form or another. La Mothe Le Vayer himself, in his remote, erudite fashion had written:

Enfin pour mieux autoriser de semblables invectives, l'on fait proférer à Socrate cette raillerie, à l'égard d'un peintre qui s'était fait médecin, qu'il en avait usé finement, puisque la terre couvrirait à l'avenir ses fautes, qui étaient devant son changement exposées à la vue de tout le monde⁴.

The latter part of the *Prose chagrine* was devoted, as we have mentioned, to a moderate criticism of the doctors—a criticism so moderate indeed that it sometimes became almost a defence. The sceptic is annoyed at the self-sufficient and dogmatic attitude which certain physicians adopt⁵; but he will not agree to their being unjustly and ungratefully attacked⁶. He defends the practice of bleeding in moderation: 'y a-t-il un plus présent secours, ou un plus souverain remède à plusieurs maladies que la saignée?' but adds: 'Je connais des personnes qui protestent de ne craindre pas moins un médecin qu'une maladie'⁷.

Molière had reason to fear both. An attack of pneumonia early in 1666 had permanently damaged his constitution; and from this time he was rarely without a painful cough, and suffered also from haemorrhage of the lungs. He probably suspected that he would never live to be one of those good-humoured old gentlemen—the Argans or the Béraldes—whom he excelled in portraying; and also that the physicians were helpless to cure him. This knowledge was not likely to soften the half-bitter, half-humorous vendetta which he had declared against them. In 1669, with *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, he returned to the attack. There is nothing really new here either in the pleasantries or the burlesque con-

¹ *Médecin malgré lui*, Act III, sc. ii.

² *L'Amour médecin*, Act II, sc. i.

³ *Médecin malgré lui*, Act III, sc. i.

⁴ *Prose chagrine*, Bk. II, ed. cit., II, p. 1143.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 1141–2.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1144.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1143.

sultation. It is for the 'high jinks' that Molière continues to invent; and there are no scenes more rollicking than the two which conclude with Pourceaugnac in flight before the apothecary and his 'matassins'¹; the tone, however, remains satirical, and we have as yet no positive doctrine such as will appear in *Le Malade imaginaire*.

It was in the winter of 1672-3, when his health was definitely breaking down, that Molière began to compose his last *comédie-ballet*. In the solitude of his study, he ruminated bitterly on his joyless life and on the difficulties which now beset him; and a more poignant and personal tone than he had yet allowed himself crept into what he was writing:

Votre plus haut savoir n'est que pure chimère,
Vains et peu sages médecins;
Vous ne pouvez guérir, par vos grands mots latins,
La douleur qui me désespère...²

One can see him about this time turning curiously over the pages of La Mothe Le Vayer, in quest of amusement or inspiration; and his eye certainly came to rest on a passage in the *Dialogue sur l'Opiniâtreté*, written more than forty years before, but as fresh as anything which had come recently from the sceptic's pen. It is a mistake, says Cassander to Ephestion, to dread a violent or untimely death; and, on the other hand, the slow decline of old age is not a thing to look forward to.

Que si l'on considère les douleurs d'un pauvre languissant, la tyrannie des remèdes dont souvent on l'assassine, les déplaisirs que lui donnent une femme et des enfants gémissants, les persécutions de ceux qui veulent profiter de ses dépouilles, les fâcheux spectacles qui lui sont représentés de toutes parts, les inhumanités officieuses dont on opprime la faiblesse de tous ses sens... bref toutes les dépendances misérables et tous les accessoires inévitables de cette belle mort prétendue, à mon avis, qu'on sera contrainct de confesser qu'il n'y en a point de plus horrible...³

Molière had only to read this passage for the whole idea of Argan's position to take shape in his mind. The play had of course to be a comedy, and the 'pauvre languissant' an imaginary invalid; but, for the rest, almost everything was indicated in these few lines: 'la tyrannie des remèdes' of M. Purgon; the 'dépendances misérables' which bestrew the sick man's room; the 'inhumanités officieuses' of Toinette, buffeting her master with the pillow; and even the designs of Béline who, when she thinks her husband dead, neglects nothing in order to 'profiter de ses dépouilles'.⁴ But the play, as always, must be a comedy. A sterner effort than ever was required to force himself to gaiety; and a wry grimace passed over his features as he made Argan check his apothecary's account or the sugary Béline fondle and humour her hypochondriac of a husband.

¹ Act I, sc. x and xi.

² *Malade imaginaire*, Prologue.

³ Ed. Tisserand, p. 189. The *Dialogue sur l'Opiniâtreté* first appeared in 1631.

⁴ Act III, sc. xii.

From time to time he recollected a trait from the books he had been reading. In the same dialogue on *Obduracy in Opinion*, discussing the dangers of over-population, the old scholar had recalled the myth of Jupiter smiting Æsculapius with his bolt, for having prolonged the lives of too many mortals, and taught his art to men:

Ipse repertorem medicinae talis et artis
Fulmine Phoebigenam Stygias detrussit ad undas;

'pour raison de quoi [adds Le Vayer] ses descendants n'ont pas grand sujet aujourd'hui de craindre ce Jupiter ni son tonnerre¹.' Again, the last words of the *Prose chagrine* were a warning against the bigoted and domineering practitioners of the old school:

Si vous vous hasardez de soutenir que purger hors de saison, c'est *ignem gladio fodere*, contre le précepte de Pythagore; et que la saignée immodérée ne sert parfois qu'à faire poétiquement sortir l'âme avec le sang; ils crient aux ignorants, et s'irritent jusques à convertir tout ce qu'ils ont de flegme en bile² ..En vérité il est difficile de se retirer sans chagrin, et sans une espèce de mortification, d'avec de si injustes personnes³.

How often had Molière himself made comedy of this theme, in *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* especially! Here perhaps he could go a little further. He could display the irritation of Monsieur Purgon when Béralde has persuaded Argan to defer taking his medicine, and the terrible threats which he heaps on the poor man's head as punishment for this crime of lèse-Faculté⁴.

Now not only was the position of the principal character sketched out in advance for Molière, but the leading idea of the play, that thorough-going repudiation of the claims of medical science which Molière puts into the mouth of Béralde, had already been expressed by La Mothe Le Vayer in more than one of his writings. One should recognise, he says in the *Prose chagrine*, that the science of medicine is conjectural, and that it is not surprising if its judgments and operations do not possess all the certainty we could desire. Why then should doctors 'se piquer d'infaillibilité⁵, où toutes choses sont si obscures et si peu assurées⁶?' This is the contention of Béralde:

Argan. Pourquoi ne voulez-vous pas qu'un homme en puisse guérir un autre?

Béralde. Par la raison...que les ressorts de notre machine sont des mystères, jusques ici, où les hommes ne voient goutte, et que la nature nous a mis au-devant des yeux des voiles trop épais pour y connaître quelque chose⁷.

La Mothe Le Vayer had discussed the question more fully in one of his

¹ Ed. Tisserand, p. 188.

² Cf. Philinte in *Le Misanthrope*: 'Mon flegme est philosophe autant que votre bile.'

³ Bk. II, ed. cit., II, p. 1145.

⁵ Le Vayer of course writes 'infaillibilité.'

⁶ Ed. cit., II, p. 1141.

⁴ Act III, sc. v.

⁷ Act III, sc. iii.

Petits traités, letter XLVIII¹, which Molière may have read in the edition of 1662:

Ne vous étonnez pas de votre guérison par une voie si inespérée, *la Nature est une grande ouvrière*, qu'Aristote nomme souvent par honneur Démoniaque; et pour le regard de vos médecins, souvenez-vous qu'Esculape n'est pas moins le Dieu des augures et des divinations que de la médecine; ce que j'interprète autrement que Macrobe pour un témoignage que *tout y est plein d'incertitude et de simples conjectures*. J'ai oui feu Louis Savot, qui n'était pas des moindres de cette profession, avouer qu'on guérissait et mourait indifféremment par toute sorte de régime.... *Voulez-vous savoir l'imbécillité de l'Art, et la puissance de la Nature?* Considérez que le moindre effort de l'imagination fait plus en un moment que tous les remèdes de Galien ou d'Avicenne².

A glance at the passages in italics will show how closely Molière's views agree with those of Le Vayer:

Argan. Que faire donc quand on est malade?

Béralde. Rien, mon frère.... Il ne faut que demeurer en repos. La nature d'elle-même, quand nous la laissons faire, se tire doucement du désordre où elle est tombée. C'est notre inquiétude, c'est notre impatience, qui gêne tout, et presque tous les hommes meurent de leurs remèdes, et non pas de leurs maladies³.

Finally, so close is the parallel, Molière agrees with Le Vayer even to those 'efforts of the imagination' on which the sceptic had dwelt at some length. For here, if anywhere, is the key to Argan's character. It is imagination, that 'folle du logis,' which tells him he is ill—imagination, prompted by M. Purgon and M. Fleurant, who frighten and fascinate the hypochondriac to the top of his bent.

When all this has been said, the critic will remind us that the comic physician was a stock character on the Italian stage, and that Molière had put no new ideas into the plays under review that he could not have drawn from his own experience. Doubtless there was, besides, a close community of thought and observation among writers of the golden age, and La Bruyère and Boileau are sometimes found to illustrate Furetière or Bourdaloue. Similarity between their writings is therefore often no more than a matter of coincidence; but the passages we have cited from Molière correspond so closely with observations of Le Vayer that the coincidence, if here it is indeed such, is a very striking one.

(To be continued.)

A. LYTTON SELLS.

DURHAM.

¹ M. Emile Magne calls attention to the similarities between the opinions expressed by Béralde and this letter, which however he does not quote (*Une Amie inconnue de Molière*, p. 125).

² La Mothe Le Vayer, *Œuvres*, 1662, II, pp. 581-2.

³ Act III, sc. iii. Cf. Matthew Prior's amusing epigram:
'Cured yesterday of my disease,
I died last night of my physician.'

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

TWO HAWKING TERMS.

In voce *last* sb.² the *Oxford Dictionary* gives: '† 4. ? A dozen (of hawks). Obs. 162. Horsey *Trav.* (Hakl. Soc.) 234 Two white garrfaulkens, a last of girckens and a last of sloght faulcons and two gashaukes.' No other example is given.

When Dr Bense was writing the article on *last* for his suggestive, interesting and documented *Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff), he consulted me on the meaning of the word in this particular sense. On p. 179, first column of part III, which was recently published, he writes: 'His (that is my) opinion is that in this case the word means a load = as many as could be carried on a "cadge." Why it should be "a dozen," Prof. Swaen is at a loss to comprehend.' My reason for this conjecture was that on p. 229 of the *Travels* it says: 'He sent me... a store of verie choiz haukes of all sorts.'

Since I gave Dr Bense this opinion, I have had the word constantly in mind while reading English books on falconry, but have not come across it in any other treatise on falconry or book of travel, nor have I found any trace of the word in Dutch use in connexion with hawking. Reading Dr Bense's entry the thought suddenly struck me: is perhaps *last* a printer's error, or based on a misreading of Horsey's manuscript? Is perhaps *cast* meant, a well-known falconer's term for two hawks, originally 'the number of hawks cast off at a time'? There are several examples in the *Oxford Dictionary*, to which I add one from Richard Blome's *The Gentleman's Recreation*, 1683, chap. xxiv: Certain Terms of Art in Falconry: 'A Cast of Hawks are two¹.' 'Cast' suits the context very well, because there were two gerfalcons and two goshawks. I am afraid 'last' is a ghost-word after all.

In voce *slight* 'a. 2. slender, slim, thin; of a small and slender form or build' the *Oxford Dictionary* adds: 'b. The slight falcon = Falcon-gentle,' giving examples from Fletcher, *Russe commonwealth* (1591), Latham, *Falconry* (1615), *The Family Dictionary* (1725), and Sebright, *Observations on Hawking* (1828). Before discussing the term, I add some further examples to show that the word was in common use:

'The Long-winged Hawks are the *Faulcon* or *Slight-Faulcon*, the Ger-

¹ P. 117 of E. D. Cuming's edition of the part on Hawking, Cresset Press, 1929.

faulcon, Lanner, Bawrel, Merlin, and Hobby,' Blome, *The Gentleman's Recreation*, Hawking, chap. II¹; '*Faulcon or Slight-Faulcon, her Tassel Gentle,*' *ibid.*; 'the *Faulcon or Slight Faulcon* is of several shapes,' *ibid.*, chap. IV² (1686).

'There are several other errors which must be rectified in a *Haggard-faulcon, Faulcon-gentle, or Slight-Faulcons* (which naturally are all of one kinde, yet differ much in quality and condition),' *The Gentleman's Recreation*. By Nicholas Cox, London, 1677, p. 174; 'The colour of these Worms is red in a *Slight-Faulcon,*' *ibid.*, p. 176.

'The colour of these worms are (*sic*) red in a *slight falcon,*' *The Sportsman's Dictionary*, London, MDCCXXXV, vol. I, in voce *Hawk*.

'As for the terms "gentle" and "slight," they seem most properly to belong to peregrines which had been caught after they left the nest, but before they began to migrate,' *The Art and Practice of Hawking*. By E. B. Michell, London, 1900, p. 19.

'It is, however, of course, possible to capture her either in early autumn before the migration has commenced—in which case a peregrine is more properly called a slight falcon or slight tiercel—or late in the winter,' *ibid.*, p. 70.

G. Lascelles in *Coursing and Falconry* (Badminton Library), London, 1912, gives 'Slight Falcon—A peregrine' in the 'Glossary of Terms' on p. 253.

Finally I must draw the reader's attention to the form *sloht* used by Horsey in the passage quoted under 'last.' Previously Horsey had used the form *slight*: 'He ment none should know of his goings nor follow him: folowed the friers advice; and after a slght faulkon that stoped at a foulle, tother side of the river, he ventered the ford a nearer waye, was at the castell gate before that company could com aboute' (p. 219).

No falconer would dream of calling a peregrine 'slight' in the sense of 'slender, slim, thin; of a small and slender form or build.' It is the largest of the indigenous long-winged hawks, a strong, powerful bird, a good deal larger than the merlin and hobby. There must be another ground for the appellation, and this, I believe, must be sought in the Dutch name for the peregrine, viz. *slechtvalk*³, which means 'common falcon.' It is a well-known fact that several Dutch hawking terms penetrated into various European languages owing to the circumstance that, from the Middle Ages onward, the Dutch falconers have been the great providers of trained hawks: I need only mention *hagard* and *mutes*⁴. Perhaps the

¹ *Ut supra*, p. 14.

³ See *Neophilologus*, xv, p. 42.

² *Ut supra*, p. 18.

⁴ See *Neophilologus*, III, p. 204.

earliest proof of the contact between England and Holland in matters of falconry is the following passage from *The Boke of St Albans*: 'Bot ther be now vsed of Duchelande bellys: of a towne calde durdright¹, and thay be passing goode, for thay be wele sortid well sowned, sonowre of Ryngyng Shulnes and passing Well lastyng' (W. Blades' edition, London, 1905: Of hawkys Bellys). For commercial relations in general between the two countries I refer the reader to Dr Bense's *Anglo-Dutch Relations*, The Hague, 1924. Although 'sight falcon' has not been registered before c. 1625 it may of course have been taken into the language at a time when the *gh* was still pronounced in English² in a manner not very different from the *ch* in the mouths of the Brabant falconers who brought their birds from Valkenswaard and the adjoining country. As *sloght* occurs only once it will be safer not to try an explanation. The German *Schlecht-falk* appears to be comparatively late; cf. H. Schmidt, *Die Terminologie der deutschen Falknerei*. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1909, p. 111. 'Slight' for 'slecht' can be considered as a case of popular etymology.

A. E. H. SWAEN.

AMSTERDAM.

AN ATTEMPT AT DETERMINING THE DATE OF TWO LETTERS OF BAUDELAIRE.

These two letters of Baudelaire to his editor Poulet Malassis, printed in the collected letters published by the *Mercure de France* (pp. 355 and 357), are attributed by the editor, it would seem wrongly, to March and April, 1864. It will be readily admitted that the two letters belong together, that a month at most separates them; it follows therefore that, if one of them is moved from its present position, the other must also be moved; if one remains the other must also remain.

Importance attaches to the date of these letters, because, since the second has hitherto been held to have been written on April 15, 1864, it has always been stated that it was on that date that Poulet Malassis went to Brussels. This has always seemed in itself highly improbable. Moreover, he must have been in Belgium at the end of the previous year supervising the publication of *Le Parnasse Satyrique du 19ième Siècle* which was announced from Brussels as early as November, 1863. And, further, in the Law Courts in June, 1865, when judgment was passed on Poulet Malassis *in absentia*, it was stated that he had been a resident in Brussels since 1863 (vide Dufay, *Autour de Baudelaire*, p. 131).

¹ This is of course the modern Dordrecht (Dordt), a very important commercial centre in the Middle Ages.

² Cp. E. Ekwall, *Historische neuenghische Laut- und Formenlehre*, Berlin, 1914, p. 95.

Considering the two letters together, we can by internal evidence give them clear limiting dates: the first cannot have been written before August 13, 1863, the date of Delacroix' death, since Baudelaire in it asked Poulet Malassis for information concerning his works for the obituary articles he was preparing. The second was written before Baudelaire had come to the final agreement with the publisher Michel Lévy, about the publication and rights of his translations of Poe; the possibility of such an agreement is mentioned several times in the letters of Baudelaire to his mother during August and September, 1863 (vide *Lettres Inédites à sa Mère* published by Conrad, pp. 285-90, and *Nouvelles Lettres Inédites à sa Mère*, pp. 176-8). In the second letter to Poulet Malassis Baudelaire mentions that he has seen Lévy who has asked for a week to consider what he can offer. This agreement was reached some time before November 25, since in a letter to his mother of that date (vide *Lettres Inédites à sa Mère*, p. 288) Baudelaire talks of the matter as being settled.

The letters were then both written between August 13 and November 25. As the second letter is dated the 15th of some month and Poulet Malassis was leaving the same day, he must have done so on the 15th of some month between August and November. But Baudelaire, in the letter, mentions the fact that he himself will not leave until the end of October. Poulet Malassis must then have left before the end of October. Since it seems impossible that the first letter should have been written after August 13th and the second on the 15th, that is to say the day afterwards, this second letter must have been written on either September 15 or October 15. September would seem the more likely month. Moreover, two pieces of supplementary evidence quoted by Dufay in *Autour de Baudelaire* strongly support this probability. He quotes a letter from Gautier to Poulet Malassis, dated October 16, 1863 (*op. cit.*, p. 105), in which Gautier says that he has heard that Malassis is about to publish from Brussels, in the aforementioned *Parnasse Satyrique*, some poems reputed to be from his pen, which he disowns and trusts Malassis will have the decency not to print above his name. This was a time when Gautier was thinking seriously of the possibility of future election to the French Academy, and his name appearing in a collection of poems which would run the risk of being banned for obscenity, might seriously have endangered his chances of success.

Dufay also quotes a letter from La Fizelière to Poulet Malassis when he was abroad, certainly in Belgium, written between November 21 and November 28, 1863 (*op. cit.*, p. 106), in which La Fizelière talks of the *Parnasse Satyrique* and mentions the eve of Poulet Malassis' departure

as having been a Monday; he must therefore have left France on a Tuesday 15th. The only Tuesday 15th is Tuesday, September 15, 1863.

It would seem safe from all this evidence to date the second of the two letters in question September 15, 1863, and not April, 1864. The first letter, obviously written earlier, must then be prior to September 15. It must have been written between August 13 and September 15.

The obituary articles of Baudelaire on Delacroix appeared on September 2 and 14 and on November 22 in *L'Opinion Nationale*. It would seem likely that the letter was written before the end of the month to permit the material which Baudelaire had obtained from Malassis to be incorporated in the first article of September 2. It is, of course, conceivable, though very unlikely, that Baudelaire had only thought of asking Malassis' help after he had published the first article, or even the second, since it is curious to notice that two months elapse between the second and the third articles. But to anyone with a knowledge of Baudelaire's methods of publication this fact does not come as a surprise. It has, moreover, been stated that this letter is prior to the one which we have now dated September 15. Again, Baudelaire states that he is to see Lévy before the 15th—does he mention the 15th perhaps because it is the date fixed for Malassis' departure and he must discuss business with Lévy before he can know what to ask Poulet Malassis to do for him in Brussels?

This 15th must be September 15, since in a letter to his mother dated August 31 (*Lettres Inédites à sa Mère*, p. 286) he says that he is to see Lévy after his return on September 5. Further he tells Malassis not to bother about arranging a contract for lectures for him in Brussels until the end of October. It seems highly probable that this letter was written quite an appreciable time before September 15, and very likely before September 2. It could not be far wrong if it were dated as having been written in the second half of August, 1863.

ENID STARKIE.

OXFORD.

REVIEWS

Kommentar zum Beowulf. By JOHANNES HOOPS. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1932. x + 333 pp. 8 M.

The literature of *Beowulf* continues to grow in volume and is so vast, even if we leave out of consideration much of the older part, that the student who is not a specialist will welcome a manual which gives, as this book does, on the whole adequately and compactly, the results of recent intensive study of the poem. In his *Beowulfstudien* (see *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxviii, p. 244), published last year as vol. LXXIV of *Anglistische Forschungen*, Professor Hoops has discussed at length many of the problems, textual and interpretational, whereas in the *Kommentar* he limits himself in most cases to a brief indication of the views of other specialists, adding comments and criticisms of his own and only occasionally developing a fuller treatment. He expressly states in his preface that he does not intend this commentary to take the place of the notes in the current editions, but rather to serve as a supplement to them. He is therefore enabled to omit text, glossary and introduction and thereby to secure for his notes much more space than is possible in an edition, even in the monumental work of Professor Klaeber, which, by the way, is already entering on its eleventh year. Just because it is so wide in its range the book is valuable, and it saves the student the labour of hunting up countless articles and volumes, or at any rate puts him on their track.

A worker in the *Beowulf* field can hardly hope to throw more than a small ray of light on the many dark places of the poem; when he does put forward a novel suggestion he is expected to furnish evidence, wherever possible, from the poem itself. To the textual criticism of the poem Professor Hoops makes comparatively few contributions of his own, though this is a field where there is still room for new methods of approach. He is too much inclined, we think, to accept emendations, which though supported by ingenious argument are alien to the language as well as to the spirit of the poem, and occasionally he gives his approval to interpretations which strain the meaning of ordinary words. In many instances however he dismisses a suggested emendation or interpretation with a curt 'unberechtigt,' 'unnotig,' 'unwahrscheinlich,' 'fälschlich,' without giving his reasons for the judgment, a fact which leads one to suppose that the commentary was intended primarily for his own students. After all, very few emendations secure universal acceptance; *suum cuique* is the rule; in other words, each emendator backs his own fancy. Still, it is surely a fact that the best emendations are those which satisfy metre, grammar and context, and which, above all, are in accord with the language of the poet. For this reason words based on Old Norse forms, but not found elsewhere in Old English, are less acceptable as emendations than words that occur in other parts of the poem itself,

and further, emendations involving words which occur only in late prose are to be viewed with caution.

A useful feature of this book is the detailed etymological treatment of words; on the prepositional phrase *fram ham* in l. 194 Professor Hoops has written quite a little treatise.

Some of the notes involving metrical considerations are far from satisfactory. In l. 758 the MS. reading *gemunde þa se goda mæg Higelaces* is said to be supported by *gefeng þa be eazle*, the MS. reading in l. 1537, but in each of these lines an emendation is necessary for the sake of the alliteration. Such half-lines are fairly common in the poem, and belong to that modification of the A type in which the alliterating word at the end of the half-line, a noun or its equivalent, alone receives a full stress, while a verb in the indicative preceded by one unstressed syllable has alliteration with weaker stress; cf. *aras þa se rica* l. 399, *onfoh þissum fulle* l. 1169, *gewac æt wige* l. 2629, etc. In l. 1379 the MS. reading *felasinnrigne secg*, usually emended to *sinnrigne secg*, is retained, though, *pace* Kemp Malone, it is metrically impossible. It is conceivable that the poet started the line with *felasinnrigne*, used absolutely, and then, adding *secg*, forgot to delete *fela*. In l. 1892 Professor Hoops finds all editors before Klaeber mistaken in reading *nōsan* instead of *nosan*, but here the metre absolutely requires the second stressed vowel to be long. Again, in l. 2488 Grein's suggestion *hreas heoroblac* for the MS. reading *hreas blac* is preferred, 'in spite of Holthausen's scruples on the score of metre.' All the same, Holthausen is right. The MS. reading in l. 2673, *bord wǣð rond*, is emended by all recent editors to *bord wǣð ronde*; otherwise it is unmetrical, but Dr Hoops dismisses this with an 'unberechtigt.' In l. 150, as in l. 410, he reads *undyrne*, *cud*, taking the words as adjectives of similar meaning asyndetically juxtaposed, but the other examples quoted by him from the poem of such a construction occur in the *first* half-line and are therefore not good evidence. We are told that in l. 305 *ferhwearde heold* is metrically 'smoother' than *ferh wearde heold*, but surely it is uncritical to apply a modern conception of 'smoothness' to O.E. versification.

The notes on the legendary-historical 'digressions' and on the personages therein concerned are generally full, clear and helpful, except in the case of the Finn and Hengest 'episode,' of which there is no introductory indication of difficulties of interpretation, no attempt at a reconstruction of the course of events, and, strange to say, no mention of the relation of the *Finnsburh Fragment* to the *Beowulf* story. Here Professor Hoops has limited himself to a brief mention of a few recent studies and notes on a matter in which the student needs clear guidance. His suggestion that in l. 1086 the expression *oðer flet* refers to the 'second or lower half' of Finn's hall, on the analogy of Scandinavian halls in later times, conflicts with the express use of the word *healle*, which surely means a separate hall where, to conciliate the Danes, Finn undertakes to hold a court after holding the usual one in his own hall. In l. 1068 *se fæx* does not mean 'misfortune,' but 'sudden attack'; this mistake has led more than one commentator astray. Schücking's inter-

pretation of l. 1106, *þonne hit sweordes ecg syððan scolde*, is said to be 'durchaus einleuchtend,' but 'merkwürdigerweise ohne Anklang zu finden,' a naive admission. Of the famous 'Modthryth episode,' as he calls it, a full survey and discussion are given, but the reading suggested by Dr Hoops in l. 1931, *Modþryð o wæg*, 'Modthryth ever displayed,' is hardly likely to find acceptance, even though he himself finds that it 'satisfies sense, grammar, metre and style.'

In l. 1382 Professor Hoops, with some other commentators, retains the MS. reading *wundinn golde*, which he explains as an old Anglian form inadvertently copied by the scribe from the MS. before him. This raises the large question of the language, both of the poem in its original form and of the MS. which was copied by the two scribes who wrote our MS., Cott. Vitellus A xv. Some textual critics apparently assume that the two scribes normalised into the current literary West Saxon the Anglian or partially Anglian text which they were copying. Yet there is abundant evidence that both these scribes, particularly the first, were of limited intelligence and unlikely to have been capable of any such normalising. Moreover, there is not much evidence to show that the MS. they were copying was itself old or that it retained more than a few traces of the original dialect in which the poem was written, for if it had been otherwise, these worthy copyists, we may be sure, would have transmitted the text in the same servile and rather careless manner as they have in fact transmitted the text of the MS. from which they wrote Vitell. A xv. We have little doubt that the normalising had already been done in this MS. or in an earlier one still. The form *wundini* to our mind merely illustrates the obtuseness of the first scribe, who failed to understand *wundnū* in the MS. before him.

In the 'Nachträge' at the end of the book the article by Professor Arwid Johansson in *Acta Philologica Scandinavica* on the Rökstein inscription should have been noted, dealing *inter alia* with the name *Hreðmanna* of *Beowulf*, l. 445.

In this mass of excellent commentary we have noted a few weak points, but these do not mar what is a really valuable book, for which Professor Hoops deserves the thanks of all students of *Beowulf*. The format and printing are all that could be desired, and we have found hardly any misprints.

W. J. SEDGEFIELD.

MANCHESTER.

Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (Germanische Bibliothek, IV, 7).
Lief. 1, 2, 3. Von F. HOLTHAUSEN. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1932.
Each 80 pp. 3 M.

This important book adds another to the many debts which English scholarship owes to Professor Holthausen. The value to all linguistic students is obvious and need not be emphasised. All that can properly be called Old English is included, even late borrowings and words from the twelfth-century *Chronicle*. Naturally the whole Anglo-Saxon vocabulary is not separately listed, and obvious compounds must be

sought under their elements. More regrettable is the absence of some account of suffixes and of composition in general, for it would have been welcome and useful. The words are conveniently arranged under early West Saxon spelling, but *e* from *o* is *æ*. There are some omissions which are hardly deliberate, but mostly they are not such as will cause inconvenience.

Holthausen, as might be expected, is abreast of all the most recent investigations, and scholars will miss some of the old familiar equations. The reason for discarding them is usually plain enough to the philologist, but an indication of the grounds for the newer view would have added to the value of the book for those who will chiefly use it. Holthausen gives instead continual reference to Walde-Pokorny and occasionally to other literature, but these hardly compensate for the absence of a notice in the Dictionary. Especially on matters peculiar to English itself or to Germanic a brief discussion would often have been enlightening. What we have is nevertheless invaluable, all the more as in addition to citation of cognates and references to further literature, Holthausen's careful and accurate scholarship not seldom throws light on points of grammar and linguistic history. A few comments are added below and some misprints are noted.

æstel from Lat. *astella* comes in the sense 'book-mark' from Ireland with the script. The North. *bædsere* is also from O.Ir. *blæd* is rather *blæd* (e.W.S. has *ē*). The borrowing in *brōc* is rather in the opposite direction. *gecēow* is needlessly altered from the recorded *gecow*. *curse* (*cirs*) is from Lat. **ceresea*. In *cræd* the vowel (and the word) are doubtful. Cf. Lind. *huncroed*. What is *cyllan* cited s.v. *cwellan*? *fyxen* (from Lye) is not authenticated. *geofon* marked 'of unknown origin' is cited s.v. *gāman*. *gristbānan* has rather short *a*. *gēogelere* (referred to O.H.G. *goukalāri*) is usually *rug-* and rather from O.Fr. Misprints occur s.v. *āte*, for *āta* l. *āth*; *bēohāta*, for *bēota* l. *biota*; *beorma*, for *at*. l. *lat*; *clibbor*, for *clifere* l. *clifer*; *cryce* l. *crycc*; *Cynete*, for *Cunetrio* l. *Cunetio*; *deag*², for *deaw* l. *dēaw*; *ðennman*, *ðrinc* l. *d-*; *gilde*², for *un-under-* l. *un-ander-*; *gold*, for *ans*. l. *ai*.

R. GIRVAN

GLASGOW.

English Lyrics of the Thirteenth Century. Edited by CARLETON BROWN. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1932. xlii + 312 pp. 10s. 6d.

Professor Carleton Brown in giving us this handsome collection of thirteenth-century lyrics has filled one of the most important gaps in the history of our early English literature. The volume contains ninety-one lyrics, fifteen of which are here printed for the first time. In three other cases we are given new versions from other manuscripts. The bulk of the material, which is thus collected for the first time, has hitherto been available only in scattered publications, many of which have been quite inaccessible to the general reader. Consequently, it has been impossible to make an adequate study of the history of the early English lyric. In following up his *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century* with the present volume, Professor Carleton Brown has performed another great service to Middle English scholarship.

We have learned to expect a high standard of textual work from the

editor's earlier volume, and once more no pains have been spared to give a reliable and sensible text. Occasionally the reader will have his doubts on minor points, such as when the editor retains the MS. reading *doh* in the well-known line from *Lenten ys come*: '*Mody meneþ so doh mo.*' or the acceptance of Professor Child's emendation of *Lord, am I þat?* (in *Judas*) to *Lord am i þat frec?* Some reference to Mr Sisam's defence of the manuscript reading might have been made in the notes. It should be observed in passing that in these two cases, as in many others which might be quoted, the editor is very sparing in his use of commas, quite frequently to the detriment of the sense. In general, however, no criticism can be levelled against the text, and where, as in so many examples, it differs considerably from the earlier printed versions, our faith in the editor's ability is never shaken. His acceptance or rejection of the manuscript readings is usually very judicious.

The orthography and capitalisation of the manuscript have been followed throughout, which is in itself a distinct advantage for the scholar. But it is difficult to decide whether the course was a wise one. The punctuation is editorial and the manuscript contractions have been expanded by the editor without the employment of italics. Further, in those cases where '3' and 'p' have been confused to the detriment of the sense, this has been remedied and the fact indicated in a footnote. Otherwise, these two symbols are retained where they appear in the manuscript, and the runic character for *w* is treated in the same manner. Since a text of this kind is not of the type of Joseph Hall's *Selections from Early Middle English*, in which the specialised student's interests are kept in mind, it seems doubtful whether anything is really gained by this method. The examples of the use of the runic *w* are relatively so infrequent that it would have been wiser to indicate them in the footnotes. The book is easier to use than *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*, for there is an index of first lines in addition to the introductory *Table of Contents* which gives the poems in the order of their occurrence in the volume. It has frequently fallen to the editor to devise suitable titles for the poems and in all cases his choice is a happy one.

The Introduction is a masterly essay on the background of the early lyrics. Especially interesting are the remarks about the earliest secular lyrics, particularly those which are accompanied with musical notes. *Now comes the Blast of Winter*, which is possibly the earliest of these, is notable because it continues the tradition of Old English poetry in its pervading note of melancholy. In the early poems of this type the close association between the phases of nature and human moods has already begun and has not yet descended to the level of a mere convention. The most beautiful expression of this association is perhaps found in *Sunset and Calvary*:

Nou goth sonne vnder wod,—
Me reweth, marie, þi faire Rode.
Nou goþ sonne vnder tre,—
Me rewep, marie, þi sone and þe.

The editor is certainly right in regarding this as a popular lyric.

The bulk of the pieces are of course religious and didactic of various types. Of particular interest is *Stabat iuxta Christi Crucem*, a Latin sequence translated into English which, as Professor Carleton Brown says, may represent a very early instance of the use of English in a liturgical office. The lyrics of the second half of the century are extremely varied in type and quality, and the editor exercises great care in elucidating the many problems of chronology which present themselves. The first eleven pieces in *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century* the editor would now assign to the thirteenth century in the light of the wider experience he has gained in his further study of the lyrics.

The notes are a mine of information and are usually very full and helpful. The excellent thing about them is the wide background that is brought before the reader in the introductions to the various pieces. The notes on the interpretation of individual lines are often rather inadequate and the reader is too frequently left to explain difficult forms himself. But if one must have any serious quarrel with the notes, it is the feeling that the editor could have told us so much more out of his vast store of knowledge, if only he had chosen to do so.

In the Preface Professor Carleton Brown refers to 'the drudgery of compiling the glossary,' and judging from the results, one may well imagine that the work did not prove a labour of love. It is indeed difficult to know for whom the glossary was intended. The student will not be particularly grateful for being told the derivation of *klippen*, *liggen*, *loken*, *wepen* and *wimmon*, while he is left to discover for himself the etymology of *gore* in the phrase *vnder gore*, or of *ateliche*, *atwiten*, *bipechen*, *biueren*, *donken*, *fandinge*, *frakel*, *grullen* or *warred*. Too frequently is the etymology of simple words given, while difficult forms are ignored. The scholar is left to puzzle out the many obscure words that occur in the lyrics for himself or the difficulty is unintentionally covered up by assigning the meaning required by the context without further comment. The general reader who may have but little knowledge of Middle English will find the glossary hard to use owing to a dearth of cross references to the numerous phonological variants of words. Middle English editors ought to tell their readers on what principle they intend to give the etymologies. Otherwise, no omissions in this matter should be allowed. The linguistic apparatus of this book is its only weak point, and it seems a pity that for the sake of a little extra expense such a weakness should have been permitted.

Whatever criticisms, however, are made on this account, it must be acknowledged that Professor Carleton Brown has performed the essential task with the thoroughness which we should expect from him, and all scholars will gladly acknowledge their indebtedness to him.

J. P. OAKDEN.

ST ANDREWS.

The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. Edited by FREDERICK S. BOAS.
London: Methuen and Co. 1932. vii + 222 pp. (with three facsimiles).
8s. 6d.

Dr Boas has given us a scholarly edition of Marlowe's memorable play. New light is thrown on its history and on the relations of the first two quartos; the texts are carefully collated; the commentary is full and illuminating; and the work as a whole is a valuable addition to our knowledge of Marlowe.

He gives valid reasons for accepting 1592 as the date of the play. *The historie of the damnable life, and deserved death of Doctor Iohn Faustus*, which Marlowe used as the basis of his play, was issued by Thomas Orwin in 1592; the title-page claims that it is a revised edition. But on December 18, 1592, the Court of the Stationers' Company supported a claim to the copyright made by Abel Jeffes 'about May last.' As Jeffes had not entered the book on the Register of the Company, he must have based this claim on publication in the month of May, 1592. The evidence, interpreted by Dr Greg, is set forth fully in the Introduction, and it may be added that literary considerations uphold it. The flexible verse of the great lines on the passing of Faustus points to a maturity of power, and the hero, whose soul-tragedy is depicted in a tragic setting, is a higher and more varied type than Tamburlaine or Barabas. In spite of the inroads of buffoonery the human interest is deeper and more sustained in *Doctor Faustus* than in *Tamburlaine* or *The Jew of Malta*.

Dr Boas bases his text, not on the earliest known quarto of 1604, but on the fourth quarto of 1616. As the 1604 text was twice reprinted, the sudden appearance in 1616 of an enlarged and much-varied version is remarkable. But each of these crucial texts preserves lines or passages not found in the other, and the task of adjusting them is delicate. Dr Boas declares for the 1616 quarto as the more authoritative. He points out that the 1616 text is quoted four times in *The Taming of a Shrew*, published in 1594, and he lays stress on the superior quality of the clown scenes as a whole in the later quarto. A comparison, for example, of the third scene in the third act—the mock-conjuring of Robin and Dick, *alias* Ralph—powerfully supports this contention. The interpolated reference to Dr Lopez, executed a year after Marlowe's death, occurs in the 1604 version (iv, v); Dr Boas finds another late interpolation in the jest, which would not have point before 1595, about 'French crowns' and 'English counters' (i, iv). Finally, he maintains that in the scenes differently arranged in the two texts the setting of the 1616 quarto is preferable. He makes out a strong case when his arguments are tested in detail.

What, then, was the 1604 quarto? It was a bad transcript, but by some means or other the transcriber got at a truncated version of the authentic text—perhaps an acting copy—for it preserves lines and passages omitted in the later text. Take the end of Act II, scene i, where it preserves a cancelled passage on which Dr Boas does not comment: he reprints it in his critical apparatus as fourteen lines of prose. It is clear that the passage was originally verse, for the opening lines can be reconstructed:

Faust. Thankes *Mephistophilus*; yet
 Fame would I haue a booke wherem I might
 Beholde al spels and incantations,
 That I might raise vp spirits when I please.
Me. Here they are in this booke. There turne to them.
Fau. Now would I haue a booke where I might see
 Al characters and planets of the heauens
 That I might knowe their motions and dispositions.

This was printed as prose, with '*There turne to them*' as a stage-direction. After that, all trace of the verse is lost. But a clue to Marlowe's original text survives. Faustus asks for a second book to show him 'al plants, hearbes, and¹ trees, that grow vpon the earth.' Mephistophiles produces it 'Here they be.' But Faustus demurs: 'O thou art deceiued.' Mephistophiles answers: 'Tut I warrant thee,' and with a final stage-direction '*Turne to them*' the scene closes. Now here, if anywhere in the play, we have a paring-down of a passage which was finally cut out altogether. It portrays an aspect of Faustus' desire to attain universal knowledge, and his momentary objection that the book is incomplete, and therefore unsatisfying, reinforces this conception. Evidently the reviser thought that, for stage purposes, one book was sufficient. The passage is textually important, for it shows the blind fury with the shears in the very act of slitting the fine-spun text.

In view of what has happened in this passage, is Dr Boas justified in his treatment of the First Scholar's request to Faustus to conjure up the spirit of Helen (v, i, 10-16)? In a scene of one hundred and thirty-five lines this is the only speech in prose—and unnecessary prose too, which is in itself a suspicious fact. Further, it preserves fossil-like a line of verse, 'which was the beautiful'st in all the world'; Dr Boas obscures the rhythm by printing 'beautifullest.' The passage also contains the description of Helen as

that peerless dame of Greece,
 Whom all the world admires for majesty—

which is repeated verbally in the speeches which follow. Dr Boas comes to the rescue of the miserable hack who shortened the original text by deleting in the Scholar's speech the words, 'Whom all the world admires for majesty,' because 'they are, in a sense, superfluous' and 'seem to be mistakenly inserted in anticipation of the kindred description...or the identical words' five lines later. But why were they inserted before their time? If we could recover Marlowe's full text, might we not find that the echo was intentional and had poetic point? Marlowe's fondness for a refrain in blank verse when the music of a line appealed to him is sufficiently attested by his repetition of 'And ride in triumph through Persepolis,' 'And entertain divine Zenocrate.' Would the use of this favourite device be unfitting in the rapture evoked by the radiant figure of Helen?

In Act iv, scene v, I still cling to the view that the lines embedded in the farcical transaction with the horse-courser are derelicts of a lost scene in verse.

Tush! Christ did call the thief upon the Cross;
 Then rest thee, Faustus, quiet in conceit.

¹ Omit this 'and,' and we get a sound blank verse.

Six lines of verse such as this, with a solemn echo of the *Dies Irae*, obtrude into the scene where Faustus swindles the horse-courser of forty dollars and has his leg pulled off. Dr Boas comments on the incongruity: 'But in an age that took sorcery and witchcraft seriously, even the trick played on the horse-courser had its supernatural aspect. Faustus, at the moment that he is making a spectacular use of his art, has the agonizing realisation that it can do nothing to arrest the remorseless approach of his fatal hour.' Now the incongruity of the context is that it does not take sorcery seriously; it takes it farcically. And the 'agonizing realisation' evaporates in an instant; in fact, it is hopelessly undramatic. A minute later Faustus chuckles over the victim paying forty dollars for a bottle of hay. This is the man who in the first flush of his magical knowledge meant to make his spirits 'fly to India for gold,' 'ransack the ocean for orient pearl,' and recover treasure-ships.

Yea, all the wealth that our forefathers hid
Within the massy entrails of the earth.

If Marlowe had a hand in the framing of this scene, or if he connived at it by inserting six lines of high-toned verse with a reference to Christ's passion, the less Marlowe he, and the inferior artist!

Single lines or passages printed in 1604 but not found in the 1616 text have to be considered in this connexion. We need not trouble about mere blunders which wreck the grammar, like 'Quarters the town in four equivalentes' left out in the description of Rome (II, i, 12), or the *ὁμοιοτέλευτον* in II, i, 9, where two lines in succession end with 'turn to God again,' which may be a printer's blunder; or passages where the censor was at work, cutting out or toning down what his evil mind thought blasphemy. The worst example of this temper is the maltreatment of Faustus' final agony in V, ii, 149 and following, 'Oh, I'll leap up to my God.' Dr Boas restores the text in all passages so affected. But we may examine some of the smaller changes where the reviser was simply saving space as he went along.

Prologue, ll. 15-17.

So much he profits in divinity,
The fruitful plot of scholarism grac'd,
That shortly he was grac'd with Doctor's name.

'Obscure,' says Dr Boas, and the repetition of 'grac'd' is 'merely awkward.' Probably the reviser too felt that, but the line has the ring of Marlowe. It may be a slip, but would a reviser *insert* a line like this? Was he the kind of man to care two pins for 'scholarism'? This nibbling at single lines is slight when we take each case in isolation, but when the process was applied systematically, the reviser got rid of an appreciable amount. I think this has happened here and in I, i, 19, 'Is not thy common talk sound aphorisms?'

I, i, 102-6.

Know that your words have won me at the last
To practise magic and concealed arts:
Yet not your words only, but mine own fantasy,
That will receive no object; for my head
But ruminates on necromantic skill.

'Another awkwardly phrased passage' of the 1604 text only, 'and possibly interpolated.' But the logical connexion of 'Yet not your words only' is extremely close and points effectively to Faustus' conclusion:

'Tis magic, magic, that hath ravish'd me.
Then, gentle friends, aid me in this attempt.

In II, i, 88, Dr Boas restores a cancelled line. When Mephistophiles has entertained Faustus with a troop of devils who give him crowns and rich apparell, he asks if he can raise such spirits when he pleases:

Meph. Ay, Faustus, and do greater things than these.
Faust. Then there's enough for a thousand souls.
Here, Mephistophilis, receive this scroll.

When once the reviser is convicted of such an excision as this, we need to watch him warily elsewhere.

IV, ii A, 101-4. A glaring omission of the 1616 text is at Faustus' last home-coming when the shadows of the end are gathering round him:

Now, Mephistophilis, the restless course
That time doth run with calm and silent foot
Shortening my days and thread of vital life
Calls for the payment of my latest years.

The text then plunges into sheer prose, 'Therefore, sweet Mephistophilis, let us make haste to Wittenburg.' It is a mistake to print these lines as verse, 'let *us* | Make haste,' with a false emphasis on '*us*.' The reviser has at this point compressed in a prose paraphrase.

With a view to a second edition, which we may confidently anticipate, I add notes on two other passages. The first concerns Bullen's 'inspired emendation,' as Dr Boas aptly calls it, of the famous line in the opening scene. His text is:

Bid *ὄν* καὶ μὴ *ὄν* farewell; and Galen come.

The 1604 text prints:

Bid Oncaymaeon farewell, Galen come.

The 1616 text attempts an emendation:

Bid Œconomy farewell, and Galen come.

In this atrocious line the 'and' is a metrical stopgap.

The other passage is in the final scene where both quartos print, with variant spellings, in a speech of clear verse the impossible line:

Ah Pythagoras' *metempsychosis*, were that true.

In Marlowe's day, Greek was pronounced by accent. Πυθαγόρου μετεμψύχωσης would give here the ringing line:

Ah Pythagóras metempsychósis,
Were *that* true,

with an impressive pause before the speaker resumes, 'This soul should fly from me.' A similar short line marking a pause for reflexion follows in the immediate context:

For when they *die*,
Their souls are soon dissolved in elements;
But mine must *live*....

Marlowe followed contemporary practice in pronouncing Greek; in the second part of *Tamburlaine*, l. 3967, 'As in the Theoria of the world' is his pronunciation of *Θεωρία*. Here are examples from Ben Jonson of *φρόνησις* and *ἀνθρωποφάγοι*: 'Your honour'd friends, Timè and Phróne-sis,' 'Anthropophági, that snatch only strangers¹.' And in the masque of *Time Vindicated* he prints a long Greek vowel but shortens it in his scansion: 'I envy not the *Ἀποθέωσις*.' So in Joseph Hall's *Virg-demiarum, The three last Bookes*, 1598, p. 62:

But if thou chance cast vp thy wondring eyes,
Thou shalt descerne vpon the Frontispice
ΟΥΔΕΙΣ ΕΙΣΙΤΩ grauen vp on hye.

In this travesty of the famous formula *μηδεὶς ἀγνωμέρητος εἰσὶτω* Hall scans *εἰσὶτω* because of the accent. A survival of this practice is our pronunciation of 'metamórphosis.'

To the difficult question of the authorship of the prose scenes and the additions, Dr Boas devotes a thoughtful section of his Introduction. He holds a brief for Samuel Rowley and has to leave over a few scenes for Birde by a process of elimination. In summing up the evidence for Rowley he is largely guided, though he uses his independent judgment, by the critical pronouncements of Mr Dugdale Sykes. As no play of Birde's has come down to us, conjecture about his share is purely nebulous. I profoundly mistrust Mr Sykes's conclusions about Rowley. He relies on the frequent use of such trivial phrases as 'O brave,' 'I warrant you,' 'as't passes,' 'zounds' and 'much ado,' as if they were word-coinaiges of Rowley; and another critic cited in a note puts forward as clues the use of 'How now,' and 'belike.' For an Elizabethan to say 'How now' when he was interrupted or startled was as common as it is for one of us at the present day to say 'damn.' A quotation from Dr Greg in a footnote on page 28 sets these flimsy verbal criteria in their true perspective—'no more than tricks of the Tarlton tradition surviving in the Queen's company.' The other suggestion of Rowley's workmanship has more to recommend it—his anti-Catholic bias; and there is one historical link with his play *When You See Me, You Know Me*, where a Saxon Bruno is a candidate for the papal chair in the sixteenth century. That blunder common to the two plays is at least something definite to work from, though it does not carry us very far.

The suggestion that the prose buffoonery from the second to the fourth act was part of the original text and perhaps written by Rowley is very difficult to accept. It is of course pure conjecture. No other name than Marlowe's was traditionally associated with the play; but for the entry in Henslowe's *Diary* we should know nothing of Birde and Rowley's 'additions.' Henslowe, we may note in passing, does not say 'new additions,' and he paid—for him—the stiff sum of four pounds. Henslowe always got his money's worth: there is no conjecture about that. If clown scenes were in the play already, what was the new matter?

I end with a few notes. In i, iii, 21, *Quid tu moraris?*—Schröer's conjecture for the hopeless *quod tumeraris* of the quartos—is adopted by

¹ *Cynthia's Revels*, iii, iv, 92; *Staple of News*, iii, ii, 180.

Dr Boas. The question is clumsy in a magic formula, as if the spell were not working. Professor G. C. Moore Smith's *quod tueamur*, which Dr Boas does not notice, meets this objection¹.

In I, iii, 107, for 'through' read 'thorough.'

In I, iv B, 33, it might be noticed that the evil spirit Belcher appears in Barnabe Barnes's *The Devil's Charter*, acted in 1607. Did Barnes borrow him from Marlowe? 'Bahol' (I. iv A. 47) is, I suppose, a first cousin of Belial.

IV, v A, 21, 'I'll not leave my horse for forty.' A parallel is the stuttering captain Tucca in *Poetaster*, III. iv. 165, 'cherish his *muse*, goe: thou hast fortie, fortie, shillings, I meane,' where the 1602 quarto prints 'fortie; schillings.' So in the *Alchemist*, III, iii, 31-2:

My share, to day, will not be bought for fortie—DOL. What?

FAC. Pounds, dantie DOROTHEE, art thou so neere?

I have naturally confined myself to textual questions and to the Elizabethan aspect of the play. It is proper to add that Dr Boas discusses the stage-history and Goethe's handling of the legend. In the essential points of history, text and interpretation, he has materially advanced our knowledge.

PERCY SIMPSON.

OXFORD.

English Literary Autographs, 1550-1650. Selected for Reproduction and edited by W. W. GREG in collaboration with J. P. GILSON, HILARY JENKINSON, R. B. MCKERROW, and A. W. POLLARD. Part III, Prose Writers and Appendix. London: Oxford University Press. 1932. 50 plates.

The publication now before us completes a work which will be a perpetual monument to Dr Greg's unbounded industry, palæographical knowledge and literary gifts, one which to students generally will perhaps have a wider and deeper interest, than any other of the multitude which now stand to his credit on the shelves of our libraries. Our hearty congratulations to him and all who have helped him.

With his well-known generosity Dr Greg, who has taken no part of the proceeds of his book, has even gone so far as to present his subscribers with ten extra sheets of facsimiles which record the handwriting of sixteen scholars and archæologists dear to his heart (Leyland, Dee, Bodley, Sir Robert Cotton, Dugdale, etc.) who have no claim to be included in the main series.

This main series, as will be remembered, consists of a hundred sheets of facsimiles. Part I, which covered the Dramatists of the period, was noticed in this *Review* in 1926, Part II, the Poets, in 1929². Each consisted of thirty sheets which illustrated a somewhat larger number of writers. Part III completes the promised century. It devotes thirty plates to the great Prose Writers of the period and ten to miscellaneous writers, who had perhaps been overlooked before, or whose writing, as

¹ See *Notes and Queries*, 10th ser., ix, p. 65.

² Vol. XXI, p. 223 and XXIV, p. 215.

in the case of John Fletcher, Middleton and Shirley, has only recently been identified. That the need of having such a margin should have been anticipated nine years ago is illustrative of the far-sighted care with which the whole work has been thought out. Again, as with the Dramatists and Poets, so with the Prose Writers, we are given an up-to-date and critically written biography of each subject, then the specimens of his handwriting often at widely different dates and in different styles, and then a printed transcription of these specimens. The collection incidentally becomes therefore a handbook of historical palæography invaluable to the student who compares the editor's transcriptions with the original manuscripts and takes note of his elucidations. But the book is more than palæography. As one passes from Ben Jonson and Massinger to Spenser and Milton, and again to Ascham and Gabriel Harvey and Bacon and Izaak Walton and Sir Thomas Browne, one feels in each case a new intimacy with the writer not to be gained from the printed page. And who can say how many identifications of manuscripts now anonymous such an intimacy may produce?

Dr Greg's work, here as elsewhere, shows the qualities which have been so happily pointed out by Sir Edmund Chambers, 'the pertinacity which will not neglect to follow up the slightest trace of evidence, and the integrity which constantly refuses to rate evidence at more than it is logically worth.' So far as can be said of any work it is invulnerable to criticism. And any remarks I append are to be read in this light. They are intended to show the interest called up at one point or another by these fascinating sheets. Under Gabriel Harvey LXXI should we not read 'ut non beneficiatis beneficiatis'? Under LXXV it is strange if Raleigh wrote of the Queen, his Cinthia, as 'Scinthia.' Under LXXIX we are told that some verses of Joseph Hall on the death 'of a Dr Whitaker' were printed in 1596. The reference is to the distinguished theologian Dr W. Whitaker, Master of St John's, who died in 1595. Under LXXXI it is said that Wotton in spite of having taken deacon's orders 'obtained no preferment in the church.' It is clear however from Walton's *Life* that Wotton's only motive for the step was to comply with the Eton Statutes.

Under LXXXVII we are told of Walton's *Lives* that 'a collected edition of the four appeared in 1670 and has often been reprinted.' But a fifth life, that of Bishop Sanderson, was added in 1678 and that of course has been reprinted with the others. Under LXXXIX we learn that the *Religio Medici* circulated, in manuscript only, till 1642 'when two surreptitious and corrupt impressions appeared.' It suited Browne so to call them, but I believe they will be found to agree closely with the early manuscripts. There is one of the latter, frequently overlooked, in St John's College, Cambridge. Under xcv, one reads that Shirley took orders, 'having presumably become M.A.' Is there any presumption that a man who took orders was an M.A.? I think not. Under xcvi should not 'P. Blis' be 'P. Bhss'? And considering that in specimen (a) the 'o' of 'money' in one case and not in another is written to resemble 'a,' would it not have been better to print in (b) 'Pax o', 'o' the (Tougne), and not 'Pox a', 'a' the'?

Dr Greg's treatment of Randolph (xcviii) is an illustration both of the caution which led him to decline to accept as Randolph's some very tempting passages which had been pressed upon him, and of the immense value of the five Cambridge autographs, three at Trinity and two in the University Registry, which he has for the first time brought together. They seem clearly not to be in the hand of the writer of *The Drinking Academy* printed as Randolph's in 1930 and declared by Dr Tannenbaum and Professor Rollins to be an author's manuscript. Unless the American editors change their point of view (and Professor Rollins at any rate seems inclined to do so), the authorship of *The Drinking Academy* can now be assigned elsewhere.

Now that the work is completed, many libraries and private individuals who have so far neglected to secure it will doubtless be eager to do so. They will be glad to hear that for a short time copies will still be purchasable at the subscription price of four guineas. But let them not wait too long.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

The Poetical Works of Thomas Traherne. Edited with Preface and Notes by GLADYS M. WADE. London: P. J. and A. E. Dobell. 1932. c + 306 pp. 7s. 6d.

This edition reproduces the poems of Traherne which are found in the Dobell and Burney MSS. and elsewhere. Miss Wade is to be congratulated on adding a new source. She has been able to ascribe to Traherne with almost complete certainty some unknown prose works and six new poems. In reprinting the poems she has retained the spelling, punctuation and the use of capitals which are found in the MSS., arguing what everyone now accepts, that these matters are part of the poetry and must be accepted along with it. I myself should have preferred a text which did not expand the contractions and ampersands. Miss Wade has some opinion on her side in doing for MSS. what contemporary printers would have done; but when MSS. are autograph, part of their beauty is that you have got them before the printer has made them something else. The point is a small one.

Since Miss Wade's editorial views are sound in these matters of capitals and punctuation, one would expect her to hold even sounder views on the larger matters of sense and metre. She disappoints the expectation. The Dobell MS. is autograph except for some corrections, found by Miss Wade to be in the hand of Thomas's brother Philip. But having made this useful discovery, she has printed the MS. in its final form, i.e., her edition represents the work of Thomas revised in twenty-two places by Philip. Traherne's own readings—often, as Miss Wade shows, preferable in every way—are given in the notes at the end of the book. The reasons for this editorial favouritism are strange: they are that 'in MSS. many corrections naturally occur, and...the principle of editing these is to give to the reader the final form' (p. vii). But surely not when the final form is that of someone else. Instead of Miss Wade's title for her book, it

would seem that the Tennysonian *Poems of Two Brothers* would have been more appropriate. There is no cause to think that Philip's corrections were directed to be made by Thomas. On the contrary, in correction 't' of Miss Wade's list, Philip is shown red-handedly making various preliminary attempts before his correction satisfies him.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

Anthology of Romanticism and Guide through the Romantic Movement. In Five Volumes. (Volume One. *Guide through the Romantic Movement.*) By ERNEST BERNBAUM. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons. 1931. 480 pp.

This *Guide* is composed of a couple of preliminary chapters on the approach to the subject and the Pre-Romantic Movement, followed by an individual study of the more important writers in separate chapters, a general chapter on the Romantic Movement, and a final chapter on the history of the study of the subject. All the chapters except the last have admirably full and well-chosen bibliographies appended. 'What I have chiefly attempted to do,' writes Professor Bernbaum, 'is to make accessible to students in colleges and graduate schools those facts, judgments and documents that recent research and controversy have brought to light.' There is a refreshing absence of -isms throughout the book, since Professor Bernbaum believes that for college students 'the study of what the great works were should always take precedence over the causes which perhaps originated them.' Not only students but their teachers should be able to profit from Professor Bernbaum's own direct criticism, from his bibliographies, and from the lists of topics for discussion—some of them highly stimulating—which follow each chapter. The title of *Guide*, which at first strikes oddly upon the ear, is justified: the claim to have incorporated the discoveries of the specialists in a textbook is no mere boast, and without inhuman detachment or arrogance there is a fair account of the sometimes widely divergent paths of criticism and an indication of those which do not lead to confusion and folly. The *Anthology* (not sent for review) one would suppose to be hardly necessary for university students, who have presumably access to the texts, but the *Guide* guarantees the wisdom of the selection, and it may be useful to the solitary student.

EDITH C. BATHO.

LONDON.

A Survey of Burlesque and Parody in English. By GEORGE KITCHIN. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1931. xxiii + 387 pp. 16s.

Dr Kitchin begins his Introduction to this attractive book by stating that it 'is intended to fill a gap in our literary history.' His aim is 'to present burlesque as a serious art, a long-established mode of criticism, which is often far more incisive, and certainly more economical than the heavy review.... The intelligent study of parody and burlesque should

furnish us with a history of English taste at once amusing and instructive.'

Dr Kitchin has however not found it an easy task to define and limit Burlesque and Parody as terms of art. He quotes definitions from the *New Oxford Dictionary*, Fowler's *Modern English Usage*, from the French M. Victor Fournel and the German Professor Lehmann. But 'for the sake of variation' he uses the terms generally as synonyms, though he has kept in sight the distinction that 'parody should be retained as a rule for direct imitations of an individual work with humorous or critical intention' while burlesque applies to the wider species of comic imitation of 'an author's work generally or that of the school to which he may be attached.'

The volume loses something in scientific precision from its fluid use of terms. But it is doubtful if any more rigid *formulae* could have been adopted in a treatise that covers so wide a range, from *The Rime of Sir Thopas* and *The Nonne Prestes Tale* to the parodies of Father Ronald Knox and Mr J. C. Squire; and that includes not only verse but prose. Dr Kitchin seems to have familiarised himself with all the aspects of his far-reaching subject and to have kept well abreast of recent publications, e.g., Mr Michael Sadler's English Association pamphlet giving an account of the novels burlesqued in *Northanger Abbey*. With its wealth of detail and its unflagging gusto Dr Kitchin's survey is in his words quoted above 'at once amusing and instructive.' But it is a little too diffuse and at times too unrestrained in expression to reach classic standard as a history of its subject.

I do not think that Dr Kitchin was well advised, while excluding dramatic burlesque from the scope of his book, to make an exception of the age of Shakespeare, 'because the beginnings of literary parody are to be found there.' His treatment of Elizabethan dramatic burlesque from *Gesta Grayorum* to *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* is too sketchy to be of real value.

It is in dealing with the parodists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that Dr Kitchin is at his best. It is noticeable that he is inclined to see in *Shamela*, of which Fielding is now generally recognised as the author, 'our best prose parody, certainly before *Northanger Abbey*.' About forty years later, in the sphere of verse, he selects George Ellis as the first of the modern race of parodists, and quotes effectively his *Elegy written in a College Library*.

There is perhaps no chapter in the book so full of interest as that on 'Parody of Early Romantic Poets.' Dr Kitchin shows clearly how the extravagances of the Romantic movement lent themselves to attack, and how the parodists of Wordsworth, Coleridge and the rest performed a service to letters. He shows too how fortunate it was for the Byron of *Don Juan* that Frere had acclimatised the Italian burlesque manner just when he did. 'The traditional English burlesque forms would not have suited. Butler's metre and style had not enough drawling insolence about it. It was too rapid. The Pope couplet could not have taken him much farther than he had got in *English Bards*.... And now a style

associated with the decay of chivalry presented itself. It was a high hour in the history of English comic art.

Punch may not be a democratic journal; but there will be many to demur to Dr Kitchin's view of 'its essentially snobbish nature,' and to his assertion that Sir Owen Seaman, though 'the greatest *political* parodist since the days of the *Anti-Jacobin*,' displays 'a vein of hectoring superiority which does not make for the urbanity which the best parody demands.' Dr Kitchin may be comforted by noting that Sir Owen is now no longer editor of *Punch*. As an Oxford contemporary of Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch I cannot allow that he is one of the 'Cambridge crowd' of parodists, though he now holds a Cambridge Chair. And why is A. D. Godley mentioned only as an editor of *Rejected Addresses*, and even so does not appear in the index? And who is Sir Henry 'Hadow'? These are points which may call for attention when, as I hope, the book goes into a second edition.

F. S. BOAS.

LONDON.

H. J. REESINK. *L'Angleterre et la littérature anglaise dans les trois plus anciens périodiques français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709.* (*Bibliothèque de la Revue de littérature comparée*, LXVII.) Paris: H. Champion. viii + 432 pp. 90 fr.

Miss H. J. Reesink has been unfortunate, or too modest, in the title which she has given to this work. There is no indication that its major part, allowing for the difference of type, consists, not in the lists of the English contents of the three periodicals which she has examined, but of an enlightening survey of the knowledge of England and English books in Holland and France at the close of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries.

Her main thesis, if it is fair to speak of a thesis in so carefully balanced and objective a survey, is that the 'Anglomanie' of the eighteenth century was no new discovery of Voltaire, Prévost and Muralt, but began already in Holland at the end of the previous century, its pioneers being the founders of the three reviews she studies, Bayle, Le Clerc and Basnage. Such is her justification for the detailed analysis of the English contents of the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* (1684-93), the *Bibliothèque universelle et historique* (1686-93) and the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans* (1687-1709), edited respectively by these three critics.

English literature only comes in for a share of attention in the last of these journals; neither Bayle nor Le Clerc has anything to say about it. On this point Miss Reesink pertinently remarks (p. 149): 'Tous ceux qui ont parcouru cette section de notre Index ont dû se demander, comme nous: Pourquoi ce silence absolu sur Shakespeare et Bunyan, et pourquoi sur le poète Milton rien que ces quelques lignes peu élogieuses dans le Journal de Basnage?' Bunyan was early translated into French, Dutch and German, and relatively popular; and it certainly does seem strange that his name should never be mentioned. The case of Milton is more easily explained: the Continent was so impressed and shocked by his

political writings that the interest in his poetry was slow in awakening; he was long what Comminges told Louis XIV: 'un nommé Miltonius qui s'est rendu plus infâme par ses dangereux écrits que les bourreaux et les assassins de leurs rois.' Apart from the occurrence of Shakespeare's name (1693) in the quoted English title of Rymer's *Short View of Tragedy*, it is only mentioned once in the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans* (1698) in a discussion of Dennis's reply to Collier: 'mais qui est-ce hors d'Angleterre qui ait entendu parler de Spenser, de Milton, de Ben Jonson, de Shakespeare?' This, says Miss Reesink, is the first mention of Shakespeare in a French periodical in Holland. It is perhaps of interest to note that I remember coming across the poet's name in a Dutch journal, *De Boekzaal der geleerde Weereld* as early as 1693.

J. G. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

The Reception of English Literature in Germany. By L. M. PRICE. Berkeley, California: University of California Press. 1932. 8vo. vii + 596 pp. 36s.

Since it was first published and reviewed in these columns in 1920 this exhaustive study of Anglo-German literary relations has become a standard book of reference which is never far from the scholar's elbow. This new edition provides a welcome and permanent addition to the 'literature' of the 'Goethe-Jahr,' and in its treatment of a theme of 'Weltliteratur' would have been assured of a good reception by the poet who so openly confessed his appreciation of, and debt to, English literature. Yet it is scarcely a 'Goethe-Buch,' as the dedication to Professor Hohlfeld claims, except perhaps in the sense that Gundolf speaks of German literature of the eighteenth century as a preparation for that fulness of content and expression which alone made the advent of Goethe possible. Nor is the title of the book quite descriptive of its contents, and it would have been more accurate to have added the restrictive qualification 'since the beginning of the eighteenth century,' for there is little attempt to supplement the works of Herford or Waterhouse. The chapter on the seventeenth century is still a mere sketch, although it does incorporate the recent valuable research on the 'Englische Comoedianten.'

In its second edition the book has been improved, not only by the incorporation of much new material which has been discovered since 1920¹, but by a still more important change in the conception of the work. It is no longer the mere accumulation of facts, but an attractive textbook of literary criticism, with the facts correlated by the author's mind. Mr Price modestly gives what credit may be due for the new form to his wife; he is to be sincerely congratulated on the choice of his collaborator.

The new orientation in literary criticism, although it is nowhere stressed, has not been without significance for the making of the new edition. Not that Professor Price has any thesis or private theory of his

¹ The studies listed in the Bibliography have risen from 1015 to 1180.

own to support, and he wisely abstains from misleading generalizations. But his conception of 'influence' is wider than it was in the earlier volume and reflects the discredit into which the mere pursuit of 'motives' has fallen since Scherer's day. The new book is concerned with the history of taste and of ideas, with 'Gehalt' and 'Form' rather than 'Stoff.' It was no doubt this revaluation which was responsible for the deletion of such a typical chapter of pre-war critical method as that on Bohtlingk's *Shakespeare und unsere Klassiker*, and for the incorporation of that on Gundolf's *Shakespeare und der deutsche Geist* into the text. The claims of 'Geisteswissenschaft' have been further met by the addition of a chapter on Shaftesbury whose influence Hettner first pointed out, an influence which, as modern research has proved¹, was paramount for all the great German writers of the classical period including Goethe, who received from him 'Der Dichtung Schleier aus der Hand der Wahrheit.' Similarly it seems likely that Herder's subjective conception of poetry owes more to Henry Home, philosopher, than to Edward Young, poet and critic, that even for his epoch-making method of historical criticism he was chiefly indebted to English sources, to Home and Richard Hurd. John Locke is shown to have influenced Thomasius and through him Gottsched, and indirectly the whole trend of German thought.

Many of the chapters of the earlier book have been almost entirely re-written, and there is none which has not profited by the results of recent research. Mr Price himself is responsible for much fresh information on Richardson which has found a place in a new chapter on the 'Moralizing Novel.' Other scholars have recently re-emphasized the influence of Sterne and Goldsmith with special reference to Goethe. The importance of Burke for the aesthetic theories of Lessing, Kant and Schiller has been made clearer, but his *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, 1789, were of equal account in bringing about the political and religious reaction which followed in the wake of Romanticism². It was but natural that in Hanoverian Gottingen, the Georgia Augusta, the university founded by an English king, should have been one of the chief centres from which English influence radiated. The Anglophile activities of Lichtenberg are especially noteworthy in this connexion; the Göttinger Bund was inspired mainly by English ideals, and it was only the solid preparation of these enthusiasts which rendered possible the achievements of the Sturm und Drang.

The supreme interest in Anglo-German literary relations must always be the importation of Shakespeare. It has become more and more apparent in recent years, owing largely to the investigations of Meinel and Robertson, that Lessing's rôle in this respect has been exaggerated, and that his use of Shakespeare's name was in large measure a challenge to Voltaire and the French. And Mr Price finally disposes of the legend that English appreciation of Shakespeare was due to German initiative.

¹ Cf. O. Walzel, *Das Prometheus-Symbol von Shaftesbury zu Goethe*, 2nd ed., München, 1923.

² Especially by F. Schlegel, Adam Müller, Gentz and Gorres. Cf. the important investigations of P. Kluckhohn, A. Müller, Benno von Wiese in the *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift*, Buchreihe vols. v and xvi respectively, Halle, 1925 and 1929.

He shows on the contrary that the criticism of Herder and the Sturm und Drang was often an echo of Young, Johnson, Hurd, Home and Lady Mary Montagu; that if Goethe could acclaim Shakespeare as the 'Stern der schönsten Hohe,' he had yet little sympathy for his tragic conception of life and that, as Professor Fairley has recently demonstrated¹, Shakespeare meant almost nothing to Goethe, the creative artist, after *Götz* and *Egmont*. Schiller, though like all the German dramatists he succumbed to the spell of Shakespeare, deliberately read into him a moral purpose and insisted on finding poetic abstractions where Shakespeare had been content to portray individuals. To the Romanticists, Shakespeare was the highest type of the conscious artist, and the translation by Schlegel-Tieck-Baudissin, in spite of numerous verbal errors, still holds the field. But Tieck failed strangely to appreciate the critical penetration of Coleridge² and it was a curious abnegation of his artistic faculties that caused him to hail the pseudo-Shakespearian *Pericles* as the greatest of the plays. Students of the Shakespearian influence will derive much interesting information from Mr Price's chapter 'Shakespeare in the Nineteenth Century.' From the high-water mark of 1916 the tide of his popularity has been slowly receding, and it is noteworthy that for the year 1930 there were 200 fewer performances of the plays in Germany than in the previous year, although even then they must vastly have outnumbered Shakespeare productions in England.

In one of his last chapters Professor Price discusses the attitude of Germany towards America from the time, when under the influence of Rousseau, it was acclaimed as the home of freedom and of the noble savage. Even in 1827 Goethe could still exclaim 'Amerika du hast es besser!' It is largely a story of disillusionment which better knowledge brought in its train. Nor were the 'Amerika-müden' restricted to the early decades of the nineteenth century: Professor Price finds it necessary to protest against the erroneous conception of American characters prevalent in German fiction of to-day. But he should lay the blame rather at the door of Hollywood, for it is mainly the predominance of the American film which is responsible for the average European view of the United States and its citizens³.

The type and format of the book cannot be praised too highly⁴, and the Index and Bibliography have been compiled with scrupulous care⁵.

¹ *Goethe as revealed in his Poetry*, London, 1932, Chapter I.

² Cf. E. H. Zeydel, *Ludwig Tieck in England*, Princeton, 1931, p. 78.

³ Cf. the treatment of a parallel question by H. Jäckel, *Der Engländer im Spiegel der deutschen Literatur von der Romantik bis zum Weltkrieg*, Breslau, 1932.

⁴ I have noticed only one serious misprint: Thomas for Thomson on p. 272. But some of the references on pp. 316, 318 have gone astray.

⁵ It seems almost churlish to point out some few omissions among the 1180 numbers listed here, for several of these works have appeared since the book went to press. It might have been worth while to note that Milton first appears on the Continent not as the author of *Paradise Lost*, but as a defender of regicides. (Cf. J. G. Robertson, *Milton's Fame on the Continent in Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. III, 1908.) Under no. 586 is listed an article in this journal by J. G. Robertson on *Shakespeare on the Continent* where reference is made to Conti as the source of Bodmer's 'Sasper.' The problem of Italian influence has been studied by this same critic in detail in his *Genesis of Romantic Theory in the eighteenth century*, Cambridge, 1923. The relations of Goethe to English Literature are now conveniently

The University of California is to be congratulated on the public spirit which encourages its distinguished scholars to publish such valuable, if unremunerative, work.

The inexperienced reader of this book will need to guard against a distorted view of German letters as the mere repository of English taste and thought. It is true enough that Klopstock is inconceivable without Milton, that Lillo and Moore were the precursors of the 'bürgerliche Tragödie,' that without Richardson there would have been no moralizing novel, without Percy no *Stimmen der Völker* and *Wunderhorn*, that Shakespeare rescued the German drama from barren imitation of the French, and that Scott was the founder of the German historical novel. But the story of the English influence is only half, or even a third of the story, and needs as a corrective both the exaggerated claims for France of Reynaud¹, and the saner plea of Robertson for Italy². No nation has been more receptive of foreign influences than the German, and the history of these influences is in many cases synonymous with the history of German literature. Yet who can appraise exactly the sum of man's intellectual debt to the past, or trace all the sources of our culture? Professor Price himself has no illusions on this score; and there is no more fitting reminder of the limitations of the study of Comparative Literature than the telling quotation from Goethe with which he prefaces his work:

Ich verdanke den Griechen und Franzosen viel, ich bin Shakespeare, Sterne und Goldsmith Unendliches schuldig geworden. Allein damit sind die Quellen meiner Kultur nicht nachgewiesen; es würde ins Grenzenlose gehen und wäre auch nicht nötig. Die Hauptsache ist, dass man eine Seele habe, die das Wahre liebt und die es aufnimmt, wo sie es findet³.

L. A. WILLOUGHBY.

LONDON.

Die Sprache als Bildnerin der Völker. Von GEORG SCHMIDT-ROHR. Jena: Eugen Diederichs. 1932. vi + 418 pp. 9.80 M.

Dr Georg Schmidt-Rohr has given us an interesting, stimulating, and challenging book. It covers a very large field, adventuring into logic, psychology, metaphysics, sociology, and eugenics. From each of these branches of knowledge the author has gleaned something which throws light on language. We are told that the book is the result of nearly twenty years' study; and after reading it one feels that the twenty years have been well spent.

With much that is said on language we are already familiar; originality is shown in the method of presentation and illustrative examples. A

set forth by J. Boyd, *Goethe's knowledge of English Literature*, Oxford, 1932. The indebtedness of Herder to Ossian is admirably set out by A. Gillies in *Neue Forschung*, 19, Berlin, 1933. Among German travellers in England should be included an article by H. G. Atkins in *Publications of the English Goethe Society*, vol. x, 1928, and a recent work in *Germanische Studien*, 126, by G. W. Spink, *Ferdinand Freiligraths Verbannungsjahre in London*, Berlin, 1932.

¹ L. Reynaud, *L'influence française en Allemagne*, 2nd ed., Paris, 1915.

² *Genesis of Romantic Theory*. See note 5, p. 392.

³ Goethe to Eckermann, December 16, 1828.

wealth of examples makes it clear that each language has a vocabulary peculiar to itself, that words in two languages which denote the same object (*Schrank*—cupboard) cover quite different classes of things. Even in such a 'natürliche Ordnung' as colours *rot*, *grün*, *blau* do not always correspond to *red*, *green*, *blue*; and no one would now sing with J. Chr. Günther 'Man lobt die bräunlichen Violett.' The word *Freund* is used quite differently from the word *ami*. Extensions of meanings are determined by individual arbitrariness; from a large number of similarities some only are selected, thus in English a man may be called a *goose*, but not *Gans* in German. Since each language groups meanings in its own way 'damit ist mit den Begriffen für alles Denken, das sich in einer Nationalsprache ausdrückt, ein a priori der Denkform gegeben, an das er zwangsläufig gebunden ist' (p. 72). Thus language governs thought, and 'mit der deutschen Sprache beginnt der deutsche Mensch.' This opens the path to a discussion of the question 'what is a German?' (pp. 208–318). Since 'Rasse' is too vague to be the test the only possible conclusion is that a German is a person whose native tongue is German: 'In Wahrheit kann ein Mensch, der die Welterscheinungen, wo überhaupt er denken will, in die Ordnungseinheiten deutscher Sprachbegriffe hineinvergleichen muss, notwendigerweise nur deutsch denken, empfinden und werten lernen' (p. 302).

All this enables the author to show the disadvantages of bi-lingualism, compelling arguments which would bring joy to any schoolboy. But the aim of the book is to show how 'deutsches Volkstum' and 'der deutsche Gedanke' may be preserved and strengthened, and the section on bi-lingualism is at bottom a vigorous protest against the compulsion of German minorities to use a foreign tongue (pp. 182–96).

Throughout the book there is a tendency to mere speculation. We read on p. 200: 'Das Englische als geistiges Werkzeug, das zu höheren Denkleistungen taugt, ist für den Engländer schwerer zu erwerben als für den Deutschen.' This is not happily expressed. Schmidt-Rohr means that the German has an advantage over the Englishman in the fact that the German language contains few foreign words, and he bases his assertion on Fichte's opinion 'dass eine fremdwörterarme Sprache für alle Schichten des Volkes verständlich ist.' Fichte, of course, could not prove this assertion, and it is hardly worth discussion. Can we really believe that *Kopfhörer* and *Geist* are more intelligible to the German than *headphone* and *spirit* to the Englishman? For many Englishmen most speculative philosophy is not 'höhere Denkleistung,' but only rubbish. It is not a question of the jargon of philosophy at all. The value of a purely German vocabulary seems questionable when we find the author using such words as *Abgriff*, *Einenger*, *Neufindung*, *Kürwille*, *Notwende*, and *Ahnenseelengruppe*.

After an exhaustive investigation of language the losses to 'deutsches Volkstum' due to emigration and birth control are discussed (pp. 336–87).

There seem to be but few misprints. On page 51 *Papier* should be deleted, for *Italien* read *Italian* (p. 123), for *die Schwaben* read *Die Schwaben* (p. 188); and *unserere* (p. 201), *viele guten...viele schlechte*

(p. 240) need correction. The book is printed in German characters of an uninviting kind, and where spaced type is used the words are often crowded too closely. It will be a pity if 'deutsches Volkstum' cannot be dissociated from eye-strain.

A. C. DUNSTAN.

SHEFFIELD.

Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue française. Par OSCAR BLOCH. 2 vols. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France. 1932. xxviii + 405 pp. and 406 pp. 200 fr.

Le dictionnaire que nous signalons ici à l'attention du lecteur se présente avec une préface où M. A. Meillet, l'éminent professeur du Collège de France, expose d'une façon magistrale ce qu'on pourrait nommer 'le code de l'étymologie.' Il nous donne un aperçu de la conception de l'étymologie et de la méthode qui doit présider à son établissement. Il discute la légitimité du point de départ que les romanistes prennent d'un commun accord pour se livrer à leurs recherches, c.-à-d. le latin tel qu'il existait à l'époque impériale, et par quelques exemples frappants il n'a pas de peine à montrer qu'en bien des cas il serait nécessaire de remonter plus haut que le latin même pour préciser le sens d'un terme qui a fini par devenir partie intégrante du domaine roman. Il insiste enfin sur toutes les difficultés qui compliquent la rude tâche du philologue: absence fréquente de témoignages, à quoi l'on peut, il est vrai, remédier par la comparaison entre les diverses langues romanes ou autres; cas particuliers où l'ignorance d'un petit détail ou d'un vocable spécial interdit la solution de l'énigme (et en effet qu'un certain tiers de satire vous échappe dans la *Compagnia della lesina* et vous ne pourrez plus expliquer le rapport qu'il y a entre l'alène du cordonnier et le sens du mot français *lésine*; si le ms. qui contient la glose de *lama* ne nous était pas parvenu, que de terribles rêves troubleraient encore les nuits de ceux qui recherchent l'origine de *cauchemar*!); défaut de matériaux indispensables comme le dépouillement complet 1° des textes latins depuis le moyen âge jusqu'au xvii^e siècle inclusivement, 2° des textes français depuis l'époque la plus ancienne jusqu'à nos jours, 3° de tous les termes 'de la civilisation européenne avec les formes particulières prises dans chaque langue.' ('Car cette civilisation,' dit M. A. Meillet, 'est une et au fond elle a un vocabulaire un: le travail n'est pas commencé. L'extension du moulin à eau que n'a pas connu l'antiquité a donné au groupe de *molinus* une importance qu'on n'aperçoit que si, en même temps qu'au français *moulin* et *meunier*, on pense à *Mühle* et *Müller* de l'allemand, à *mill* de l'anglais.') Bref, conclut le savant linguiste, on ne peut actuellement songer à donner un dictionnaire étymologique du français; on ne peut que s'efforcer d'indiquer le point où en sont arrivées nos connaissances actuelles en cette matière.

C'est justement ce que M. O. Bloch s'est proposé. Il déclare que son ouvrage est purement provisoire et, s'il le publie, ce n'est que pour le faire servir de base à des recherches ultérieures.

Il commence par limiter son terrain. 'Le vocabulaire usuel du français

contemporain au sens large du mot,' abstraction faite des 'mots archaïques conservés dans les dictionnaires comme témoignages de la langue des grands siècles de notre littérature, mais sortis de l'usage' ou des mots 'appartenant à des techniques périmées ou employés par les seuls techniciens'; voilà à quoi se borne son examen. Il discute les étymologies; il ne les accepte qu'après un examen approfondi et qui dénote un esprit critique des plus rigoureux. Il date de façon aussi précise que possible l'apparition des formes; il expose l'évolution des sens; il explique les locutions les plus importantes se rapportant à chaque article traité. Il se livre à une comparaison constante entre les diverses langues romanes. Il verse à pleines mains sa documentation dialectologique qu'il a passée des années à recueillir et qui nous est d'autant plus précieuse qu'elle a été révisée par le roi des études ès parlers gallo-romans, Walther von Wartburg, l'auteur du *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Il n'est pas de peine qu'il ne prenne pour fixer un détail, d'enquête qu'il ne mène pour préciser un problème: c'est une communication de la fabrique de Leverkusen qui lui révélera la formation si piquante du mot *asprine*; c'est à M. Prevet qu'il s'adressera pour savoir comment celui-ci a imaginé l'appellation de son produit, le *goménol*; c'est à M. Haust qu'il devra des explications définitives sur *grisou* et sur *houille*, deux mots qui avaient été jusqu'ici marqués de ce fer rouge: 'origine incertaine,' 'origine inconnue.' Enfin M. O. Bloch a eu recours à quelques-unes des plus hautes compétences que compte l'érudition française pour la révision des étymologies celtiques, germaniques et orientales, et il a rendu son ouvrage encore plus utile au grand public en y ajoutant un tableau où il a su faire tenir en deux pages les principales correspondances du latin et du français.

LOUIS BRANDIN.

LONDON.

Aspremont: Entwicklungsgeschichte und Stellung innerhalb der Karlsgeste.

Von SIEGFRIED SZOGS. (*Romanistische Arbeiten*, XVIII.) Halle: Niemeyer. 1931. xii + 150 pp. 7 M.

The study of *La Chanson d'Aspremont* has evidently been a labour of love for Dr Szogs as he has nothing but praise for this somewhat lengthy epic, which he thinks worthy to be placed by the side of the *Chanson de Roland*, and in some respects even above it. The early chapters of his work are devoted to the historical background of the poem, which the writer sees in the onslaughts of the North African Saracens in Calabria in the years 901 and 902 under Abu-Abas-Abd-Allah and his father Ibrahim-ibn-Ahmed. This invasion, which struck terror into the hearts of the dwellers in Southern Italy, was brought to a sudden end by the death of Ibrahim in October, 902, and the consequent retirement of the Saracens: 'Tod des führers und flucht der Saracenen die das geschichtliche unternehmen beschliessen, bilden auch das ende unseres epos'—an end which we seem to have met before in other poems of this *genre*. The fact that these events in Southern Italy were tacked on by tradition to the exploits of Charles in Spain presents no difficulty to Dr Szogs ('wie

leicht eine Tradition sich bilden kann, lehrt das Beispiel der Karlsreise'), who locates the battle on the slopes of Aspromonte, a mountain in the region of Southern Italy where the clash between Christendom and Islam was at its fiercest. Dr Szogs considers that the double nature of the poem does not justify the view that it consists of two distinct parts, but is simply due to the fact that the historical basis provided duplicate Saracen heroes in the persons of the father and son just mentioned. We cannot overlook the fact, however, that a favourite proceeding with the poets at that time was to duplicate adventures by tracing the fortunes of two succeeding generations.

Chapter II is devoted to a literary appreciation of the poem. In spite of its length (11,376 lines in the edition of L. Brandin which forms the basis of this study), Dr Szogs considers that it presents an extraordinary unity and holds the interest to the end. He emphasizes the animation of the dialogues and the gift of vivid description displayed in some of the episodes, e.g., the hand-to-hand conflict between Charles and Eaumont. He notes a certain wealth of epithets employed by the author of *Aspremont*, for whom Charles is: 'li fix Pepin,' 'li rois de St Denise,' 'le rice roi poiscant,' 'li rois poësteis,' and adds pointedly 'beim Rolandsdichter heisst es nur: li empereres, oder li reis.' We are not sure that the advantage is entirely on the side of the 'Aspremontsdichter' here.

Proverbs and comparisons occur in much the same proportion as in the other *chansons* of the period. Dr Szogs has not quite seen the point in lines 756-7:

Et li vilains le dist en ses escriis:
Li fix al cat doit prendre le souris.

The poet is not adding his own view to Balant's defence of his action here ('an diese verteidigungsworte Balants schliesst der dichter seine ansicht hierüber an'). Balant himself, when he sees that Triämodes has designs on the crown of France, warns the king against him and concludes with the proverb 'the mouse belongs by right to the cat's son,' which brings Eaumont at once to his feet.

In a chapter devoted to 'Aspremont und Roland,' the author combats vigorously the view held by Josef Mayer that *Aspremont* is a feeble imitation of the *Chanson de Roland*, and that the main subject of the poem is really the 'enfances Roland.' He holds that *Aspremont* resembles *Roland* in not being a 'werk aus einem guss,' hence certain inconsistencies and even contradictions, which, however, are (according to Dr Szogs) less marked in *Aspremont* than in *Roland*. A degree of dependence of the *Aspremont*-poet on the *Rolandslied* he is willing to admit, e.g., certain traits of Roland's character reappearing in Eaumont, but he reduces the dependence to a minimum and refuses to see an imitation of the *Chanson de Roland* in episodes where we should feel little doubt as to the source of the poet's inspiration.

As regards the relation of *Aspremont* to other epics and to the 'roman courtois,' Dr Szogs' view is coloured by the fact that he assigns a very early date to the original poem. He agrees with other writers as to the existence of an *Ur-aspremont* which he places in the first decades of the

twelfth century if not actually in the eleventh (cf. p. 128), i.e., nearly a century earlier than the date ascribed to it by Bédier ('c'est dans les toutes dernières années du XII^e s. au plus tôt que le poète a dû composer son ouvrage') in his 'Preface' to Brandin's translation of the poem. Proportionately earlier in the writer's view is the version which has come down to us. Hence his refusal to see any traces of the influence of *chansons de geste* other than the earliest in date. On the other hand, he judges the influence of *Aspremont* on the 'jungere Epen' to have been very considerable. The author of *Girart de Roussillon* must have been familiar with the *Ur-aspremont* and borrowed certain episodes from it, whereas the author of *Aspremont* shows no signs of having been influenced by the *Ur-girart*. *Hervis de Metz* shows traces of having been influenced by *Aspremont* (according to the writer) in the episode of the 'heldenknabe' (though this had previously been instanced as one of the 'gemeinmotive'), and in the appearance of St George on the battlefield. In *Garin le Lorrain*, which Dr Szogs does not mention, three saints appear on the battlefield as they do in *Aspremont*—St Denise, St Meurisse and St Jorge (cf. section xxxiv in the edition of Paulin Paris). Does this betoken an influence of *Aspremont* on *Garin*, or of *Garin* on *Aspremont*? One realises how difficult it is to assess the action and interaction of these poems one upon another. In the end the determining factor must of course be the date. It is Dr Szogs' conviction that a very early date must be assigned to *Aspremont* which has led him to minimise also the influence of the 'roman courtois' on the poem. He says very truly that the long descriptions of persons have no place here, but adds that we have no trace as yet of 'minnedienst.' Surely this is going too far. What about the Saracen queen who has at any rate two 'drus' ('besides her rightful lord' as the author of *Aucassin et Nicolette* would say)—one of whom plucks up courage to return to the fight when he remembers the 'glad eye' (*le gent salu*) his mistress had vouchsafed him that morning? Certainly the episode of Clairon and the thirteen ladies he delivers from the tower is more reminiscent of the 'roman courtois' than of the older epic. As regards 'le merveilleux' also, Dr Szogs, whilst admitting one or two examples which might easily have occurred in the earlier *chansons* (e.g., curious beasts, strange lands, carbuncles which emit light), passes lightly over, or makes no mention of, others, such as the magic ring (l. 2656), the magic cross (l. 1747), the magic stones in Charles' helmet (l. 5894), which are more characteristic of the 'roman courtois.'

Dr Szogs' study is stimulating and provocative, but one feels that, as with some of the old historiographers, his work partakes too much of the nature of a panegyric to be quite as useful as one could wish it to be.

JESSIE CROSLAND.

LONDON.

The Pentamerone of Giambattista Basile. Translated from the Italian of BENEDETTO CROCE. Edited with a Preface, Notes and Appendixes by N. M. PENZER. London: John Lane. 1932. Two volumes: lxxv + 309, vi + 333 pp. 42s.

The *Cunto de li Cunti*, or *Pentamerone*, of Giambattista Basile—first published in 1634—is one of the few Italian prose works of the Seicento that have now any vitality except for professed students of the period. ‘Il più bel libro italiano barocco,’ as Croce has called it, its imagery and metaphors are so far-fetched and bizarre as to have sometimes led to the erroneous supposition that Basile intended to satirise the prevalent literary fashion of his day (of which he was in reality an admirer); but this baroque style is with him the medium for presenting ‘the oldest, richest and most artistic of all books of popular tales,’ in which the fabulous elements are brought into relation with the actual life of seventeenth-century Naples. The dialect is not the spoken vernacular of Naples, but a literary creation based upon it, with the intention of ‘elevating the dialect to the dignity of a language.’

Mr Penzer’s translation has been made, not from the Neapolitan original (though he has kept it in view), but from Croce’s Italian version published in 1925. The stories read excellently with their quaint mingling of elaborate conceits and metaphors with popular speech reproduced in all its native coarseness without any sort of expurgation. The introduction combines Croce’s essay on Basile in his *Saggi sulla letteratura italiana del Seicento* with that prefixed to his Italian translation of the text. Mr Penzer’s appeal is to the folk-lorist and bibliographer rather than to the student of language; each tale has copious notes on its folk-lore aspect and analogues, and there is a noteworthy appendix, ‘Folk-lore Addenda,’ to which is added an essay on ‘The Folk-tale since Basile’ by Professor Stith Thompson. In his study of the ‘Frame-Story’ (II, pp. 275–8), Mr Penzer strangely ignores the *Book of the Seven Sages of Rome*, from which the idea of the setting of the tales in a narrative framework very probably came to Boccaccio and thence to Basile. There is an exhaustive and detailed (perhaps somewhat excessively detailed) ‘Bibliography of the Book,’ upon which the editor tells us he has spent some three years. The whole format of the work—with its illustrations and reproductions—is sumptuous and attractive.

To the student of bird life, the Italian literature of the Seicento is a happy hunting ground, full of matter for innocent merriment, and Basile is no exception to the rule. The birds that sang ‘ciascuno in suo latino’ in early Italian poetry now learn ‘ingegnosi concetti’ with Giambattista Marino. But Basile can beat that. The ‘dawn chorus’ of birds—celebrated by poets from Lorenzo de’ Medici to William Blake and Robert Bridges—is thus rendered at the beginning of the *Pentamerone*: ‘The birds issue Night’s proclamation promising a good reward to the one that brings news of a flock of lost black clouds’ (I, p. 5). It would be unfair to ask a folk-lorist to be an adept in ornithology; but Mr Penzer does not always seem quite accurate in his identification of Basile’s birds. Thus, we would suggest that *pica* (I, p. 35) is not ‘jackdaw,’ but ‘magpie.’ In

the story of Gagliuso, among the birds presented by the cat (puss-in-boots though without his foot-wear) to the king, *parrella* should be 'great titmouse,' not 'blackbird'; *capofuscolo*, 'blackcap,' not 'bluetit' (I, p. 155). In the remarkable list of birds given in the story of the Seven Doves (II, p. 64), *terragnola* is a common southern name for the 'skylark,' not 'rock-dove'; *moretta* is surely the familiar 'tufted duck.' In such matters, even the best Italian dictionaries are not always completely reliable, and philologists, no less than naturalists, will find a rich field in the full lists of popular names of each species in Arrigoni degli Oddi's monumental *Ornitologia italiana*.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

LONDON.

Lope de Vega und sein Zeitalter. By KARL VOSSLER. Munich: C. H. Beck. 1932. x + 373 pp. 14 M.

This truly remarkable appreciation of Lope de Vega, replete with suggestive ideas put forward in a persuasive style, goes far to redeem the barrenness of an unproductive year. When Dr Castro laid down his pen in 1917 after translating Professor Rennert's *Life*, he used an appendix to decline the task of estimating Lope's genius, and pointed to the overwhelming mass of his work, which makes an exact estimate only possible after a lifetime of effort. It is this challenge that Professor Vossler has taken up, not in lightness of heart, but because he finds in Lope the expression—perhaps the most complete in the history of art—of an ideal which our age is dimly striving for. 'Das Verlangen nach einer stilvoll gefestigten, in religiöser und nationaler Gemeinschaft verwurzelten, über Standesunterschiede hinausgreifenden und das Leben bejahenden Dichtung ist wieder erwacht. Es gibt sich in vielerlei ungedulden und verfrühten Arbeiten unserer jüngeren Dichter in Deutschland, ja in dem ganzen europäisch-amerikanischen Kulturkreis zu erkennen. Dasselbe Verlangen hat mich im sechsten Jahrzehnt meines Lebens zu Lope geführt.' Approaching the study of Lope as *senex*, with a rich store of Italian and French scholarship and ample experience of life, the author is in a position to appreciate one whose heart beat sturdily until it was broken in his seventy-second year. He compares Lope with Goethe, and the parallel, though novel, is convincing. They are poets in whom, as in old Nestor, whole generations live. The general conscience speaks in them, though with a personal accent, for they are not literary Achilles, wrapt in a petulant egoism of poetry. As such, Professor Vossler avers, the life and activity of Lope de Vega suggest a new hope for the German people. 'Wie sollte das schwere und zerrissene Volk der Deutschen an diesem Genius der Lichtigkeit nicht seine Freude und Erquickung finden? Nicht mit dem tragischen Übermut des Vereinzelten, sondern aus glücklicher Geborgenheit in der Gemeinschaft des Volkes und seines Glaubens schwingt er sich auf.'

Lope's biography is traced in general lines on the basis of the now classical Rennert-Castro, to which the author has added (as in the reference to the Colegio de los Teatinos, and elsewhere) the results of

later researches. He appears to have read every work of consequence on any aspect of Lope's genius that has been issued in the last thirty years. In the treatment of Lope's biography, Professor Vossler aptly puts the case for a cautious handling of data offered by Lope's plays and poems. The authors of the day turned their lives into literature, but wrote them up with an eye on the accepted forms; so that between 'Camila Lucinda' and Micaela de Luján there is curiously little contact—no more than a glimpse of perishable beauty. The Coimbra editors of Camões' *Rimas* have made a similar observation with regard to Wilhelm Storck's biography of the poet, which relied heavily upon the evidence of poetry, and a similar objection might be made to Coster's *Herrera*. Add to these caveats that of Professor Morley that the dates of Lope's plays are not necessarily those of the apparently contemporary allusions that they contain, and it appears that both biography and bibliography in the Spanish field are entering on a less amateur and naive era of investigation.

There is a very suggestive chapter on Lope de Vega and Góngora. The author's sympathies are with Lope more exclusively than one would have expected, but he states with clarity and appreciation the tenets they held in common. Both authors are covered by the baroque in literature, and it is their fundamental agreement that makes their poetic duel significant. The non-dramatic works provide Professor Vossler with the readiest line of approach to Lope's genius, as they have done to others, for they alone can be taken in detail as separate works, whereas the plays are essentially a collective expression. In judging these pieces he offers some new values. To the *Dragontea* he is less friendly than the late Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly was ready to be, and brushes aside the remark that 'Lope has been censured for not viewing Drake through English Protestant standards.' The sentence must surely have been a piece of shadow-boxing by the English scholar, for who would want to see Drake in that guise? What a 'good Catholic Spaniard' could make of Sir Francis is seen in Juan de Castellanos' *Discurso del Capitán Drake* (which does not appear to have come into the Munich scholar's hands), and the complaint against Lope is that, with all his endowment of genius, he failed to present a figure worthy of notice such as emerges even from Castellanos' prosy octaves. In the *Corona trágica*—another of Lope's failures—Professor Vossler notes the effective scene between Bothwell and his wife, when the latter had to die to make room for Mary Stuart. There is a trace of the real Lope in this passage, treated in the popular manner of the Conde Alarcos' tragedy, and I think some credit should be assigned, at least conjecturally, to Father Hugh Sempill, whom Lope's preface names as well as Conn. The *Isidro* is admirably interpreted, and the critic brings out in especially high relief the inspiration which Lope drew for this and other poems from his travels among the Spanish people of Madrid, Toledo, Valencia and other towns. His exquisite sense of what the average man was thinking was, however, not merely a gift of nature, but was deliberately cultivated. One ought always to recall in this connexion Ricardo del Turia's picture of Lope mingling with the *mosqueteros* in the pit of the theatres, taking diligent note of their hisses

and applause. 'suele, oyendo assi comedias suyas como agenas, advertir los pasos que hazen maravilla y grangean aplauso, y aquellos aunque sean improprios imita en todo, buscandose ocasiones en nuevas comedias.' He remarks of the *Gatomaquia* that it leaves 'der Eindruck einer gewisser Leere, wie nach einer Ausgelassenheit, die allzulange gedauert hat,' calls attention to the special value of the poetical epistles, and notes Morel-Fatio's error in attempting to judge the Spanish *comedia* by Lope's *Arte Nuevo*, as if Spanish literature, like so much of French and especially the drama, were an affair of programmes. I should like to have seen the *Arte Nuevo* treated in more detail, and with an eye on Lope's practice; but such length might have been deemed disproportionate.

For the *Dorotea* Professor Vossler offers a new and carefully considered interpretation. In this work Lope, aged seventy, makes literature of his own life at the age of thirty. He had suffered no change of heart meanwhile, and the critic finely accounts for the curious flavour of the *acción en prosa* by showing that it is simultaneously young and old. Though there is estrangement and death in the book, there is no tragedy in a story of calf-love at the stage door; it is all too openly made an exhibition. As such Professor Vossler finds in keeping the pedantic witticisms and literary opinions and efforts of Don Fernando. But he continues: 'Ich glaube, eine klare, grosse Dichtung zu sehen.' The point he makes is, unless I misread him, that, in this and all Lope's work, the sense of the other life alone is one of reality, so that this life is a show, and 'all the world's a stage.' The virtuosity and theatricality of Don Fernando and *Dorotea's* romance and parting are thus emblems of life, and it is possible for the critic to praise this piece above the *Celestina*. But one feels that this is an undue extension of the moral of *La Vida es sueño*, the portal to Spanish literature for so many German readers. Calderón argued the unreality of life, but only casuistically, and his moral covers only the plays of abstract speculation; in his *comedias de capa y espada* there is a great deal of paste-board drama, but that is not due to any abiding sense of the unreality of life. As for Lope, the only real life must have been this one, of which religion offered him a prolongation through eternity. Even in the mystics of that epoch one critic has seen a profound realism, they seek not to lose themselves in God, but to possess God in themselves, less to spiritualise the real than to materialise the spiritual. I feel unwilling to allow the *Dorotea* the defence suggested by Professor Vossler, nor do I feel that he rightly brackets its falsity with *Don Quixote* in the phrase: 'Beide Werke sind Poetentraum, der sich über Menschenleben legt, es durchsetzt, färbt, schmückt, erhoht und—fälscht: solange bis im Angesicht des Todes und der Wirklichkeit der Zauber zerbricht.' In *Don Quixote*, as the book draws apart from the routine of daily reality, we discover, or seem to apprehend, a higher truth; in the *Dorotea* a greater falsity.

To an estimate of Lope's dramatic genius Professor Vossler devotes more than a hundred pages, and in them not one phrase is superfluous. One does injustice to his meaning at less than the original length. He

quotes the plays less as individuals than in groups, and points out that what Lope presented to the public was a continuous chain of representations, infinitely variable within the limits of popular acceptance. We must read and appreciate them as they were composed. 'Man müsste nicht immer nur einzelne Dramen, sondern ausgewählte Szenen auf die Bühne bringen und statt eines Stuckes eine Blumenlese aus vielen spielen. Spricht doch jeder Augenblick hier für sich selbst. Nicht länger sollte Lope der Gefangene seiner dramaturgischen Schablone bleiben.' But the scenes have their place in the plays and suffer by being torn out; one must read them continuously and without meditation, until they become a sort of cinematographic film dancing before the inner eye. Lope's plays are 'theatre' rather than 'drama': 'Der theatralische Sinn richtet sich auf Bühnenbild, Schaustellung, Augenschmaus, während der dramatische am Gegeneinander der wollenden und handelnden Personen sich weidet.' The author is concerned with right appreciation rather than judgment, and he reproduces in many fine observations the atmosphere of their production. He points out, for instance, that in the popular mind the American conquests were intricately bound up with the notion of the Faith; they were 'eine Mischung von Abenteuer und Gottesdienst, von menschlicher Habsucht, Kuhnheit oder Verworrenheit und himmlischer Fügung.' This sense, now scarcely recoverable by the imagination, does not make good plays out of bad, but it teaches us what to look for and appreciate. The *Nuevo Mundo descubierto*, with its casual construction and allegorical figures, 'kein Drama ist. Aber niemand, der Sinn für Poesie hat, wird sich dem Reiz eines so weit gespannten und innigen Welt- und Puppentheaterspieles entziehen können. Mit Marionetten aufgeführt, müsste es seinem geistvollen Publikum noch heute die grösste Freude machen.' Meredith complained that Lope's stage was a puppet-play, to which Professor Vossler retorts that what is puppet-like must be appreciated in that sense: 'Nicht ob es veraltet ist, wäre die Frage, sondern ob wir weise genug und reif dafür sind.' And he does not make Meredith's mistake of extending the label to all Lope's work. The basis of it all is not drama—conflict—but lyric. He brings on the boards what is 'poetabel.'

We have been wooed with strong spells back to Lope. Grillparzer, with his Austrian sympathy and stage-sense; Menéndez y Pelayo, with his massive erudition and enthusiasm for humanity; Vossler, seeking for a poetry that expresses, and does not shun, the life of average men. Grillparzer and Menéndez y Pelayo have set us re-reading the neglected poems, but our minds go wandering to Tirso de Molina and Calderón in the drama or to Góngora in the lyric, though we admit that their genius is more limited and conventional, and we recognise with intellectual assent the greater 'Lebensweisheit' of Lope. Lope is inwoven in the stuff of his age, from which the others, each in their manner, stand out. For all his humanity, we cannot aver that

deep in the general heart of men
his power survives,

for he gives not only the truth but also the falsehood that he lived

amongst. He has to full measure the superficiality, virtuosity, vanity, disorder, emotionalism and insincerity of his public. The restoration of Lope de Vega involves the reiteration of the whole social complex of Philippine Madrid and Spain, and this has been done in imagination in this remarkable work; but perhaps the task is beyond our powers, and we shall continue to turn away to the poets of higher relief.

‘Gewiss ist alles nur Schauspiel und spielende Dichtung, aber immer dort, wo das Spiel zu echter Dichtung wird, beginnt sein Ernst, seine tiefe und ewige Bedeutung.’

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

SHORT NOTICES

Volume II of the *Malone Society's Collections* is now completed by the issue of Part III (London: Oxford University Press. 106 pp.). Several notices on such subjects as the literature accumulating round the *Sir Thomas More* manuscript, Kirkman's list of 1680, the variant issues of Langbaine's *Momus Triumphans*, and a 1719 edition of Mears' *Compleat Catalogue*, are followed by two reprints: *Processus Satanae*, and *Somebody and Others*. The former is a late sixteenth-century actor's part preserved in the library of the Duke of Portland, the latter is composed of two leaves of an interlude c. 1550 preserved in the Library of Lambeth Palace. Both reprints are prefaced by a detailed description, with facsimiles, of the text.

The extracts from the Chamberlain's Accounts preserved in the municipal archives of Ipswich are extremely valuable since they correct and complete Jeaffreson's description in the Ninth Report of the Hist. MSS. Commission, and make more precise our knowledge of the provincial touring of the chief London Players between 1556 and 1625.

The remaining extracts concern London. There is a further instalment of dramatic records gathered from the Repertories of the Court of Aldermen, the Journals of the Court of Common Council and the City Letter Books covering the period 1522-1615.

Some of the extracts which follow from the records of the Lord Chamberlain of the Household have been printed in part elsewhere but not before *in toto*.

One or two slips have escaped notice in the index: for 'Audley' read 'Audely' and incorporate with 'Audely' above; there is no mention of the *Bondman* on p. 399.

J. H. W.

Professor Rollins's eighth and final volume of *The Pepys Ballads* (Indexes. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1932. viii + 243 pp. 21s. 6d. net) greatly enhances for the student

the value of the five hundred ballads he has reprinted from the Pepys collection. A few pages of 'Additions and Corrections,' the majority of which relate to the first four volumes, supplement his earlier notes with further parallels, notices of variant versions, in print or manuscript, previously overlooked, and minor emendations. Two indexes follow, the first to titles, first lines, refrains, and tunes; the second a name, word, and subject index. The latter, occupying more than half the book, is very complete, and a mine of useful reference. It is a guide, for example, to places and districts which occupied popular attention; to cant and slang phrases; to proverbial sayings, of which there is an exhaustive list, to obsolete words or meanings; to printers and publishers who busied themselves with ballad literature. To some extent, also, this index serves the purpose of a glossary, and of additional footnotes to the text. And the index testifies to the unchanging interests of men. Then, as now, accounts of hangings were sure of greedy acceptance; and Alexander the Great was a safe reference to antiquity.

H. W.

Mr E. M. W. Tillyard's lecture on *Milton: L'Allegro and Il Penseroso* (English Association, Pamphlet No. 82. London: H. Milford. July, 1932. 20 pp. 2s.) should not be overlooked by any student of Milton. Mr Tillyard's thesis is that the two poems do not spring out of Milton's 'loitering down the hedgerows' at Horton, but are derived from the *First Prolusio*n, on which they are a 'poetical exercise,' intended for an academic audience, and that they probably belong to the summer of 1631. This is not merely an ingenious theory: it is supported by good and, to this reviewer at least, conclusive reasoning. We should do well to follow Mr Tillyard's example, and pay more attention to the links between Milton's early poems, his *Prologues* and his university audience.

E. C. B.

The Memoirs of Sir Robert Sibbald (1641-1722). Edited by F. Paget Hett (London: H. Milford. 1932. 106 pp. 10s. 6d.) is a finely produced book of more than local interest; for Sibbald, besides being President of the Royal College of Physicians in Edinburgh, and first Professor of Physic at the University, made a copy of Drummond's *Conversations* which has been frequently used since David Laing printed it in 1833. Mr Hett's refutation of C. L. Stainer's theory (1925) that Sibbald, together with Bishop John Sage and Thomas Ruddiman, forged the *Conversations* for the 1711 *Works of William Drummond* forms an independently conceived—but surely supererogatory—supplement to Mr Percy Simpson's article in *Review of English Studies*, January 1926. The autobiography itself is enough to show how fantastic is the notion of Sibbald as a literary conspirator.

Sibbald, like his father, was 'a man of a mild spirit, very civil and kynd to his relations and acquaintances.' A typical minor scholar, his life was filled by professional duties and serious study; though he edited Latin poems and wrote Scottish histories, his interests were primarily archaeological and scientific. Honesty, and sincerity in personal re-

lations, are the cardinal qualities traceable in the somewhat bald and trivial outline of his life. That he was neither physically nor morally a hero he himself was well aware, and some of the most vivid moments of his narrative describe the perils of life in those days: how his father's house was plundered by Monk's men in 1651, and he and his little sister were fired on in the streets by 'the Inghshes'; how as a student in Edinburgh, on staring too long at 'a fellow markt wt irons in the face (as he gave out by the Turks),' he was chased a long way and caught a fever by his over-exertions; how he was sorely injured on the Links by an accidental blow from a 'goufe' club. His view of life was largely stoical, and 'the designe I proposed to myself was to passe quietly through the world, and content myself with a moderate fortune.'

Disgusted with the dissensions of churchmen, he chose medicine instead of divinity, and after studying surgery and physie at Leyden and Paris, rose rapidly in his profession. In Edinburgh he took sides with the physicians in their war against the surgeons, whom he came to regard, like his master Guido Patin, as 'a race of evil extravagant coxcombs who wear moustaches and flourish razors.' He set himself to find 'what animals, vegetables, mineralls, metallis, and substances cast up by the sea, were found in this country, yt might be of use in medicine, or other arts useful to human lyfe,' a project which resulted in the publication of several quant works of natural history, and the institution of 'a garden of medicine,' the *Pharmacopœia Edinburgensis*, and the College of Physicians (1681).

Sibbald's religious adventures brought scandal upon him both during and after his lifetime, and it was probably as an apologia for 'the difficultest passage of my lyfe' that he wrote his memoirs. By the influence of his friend James Drummond, the fourth Earl of Perth, he became a Catholic convert in 1685—not, he is at pains to declare, after any weighty consideration, but for affection, and because 'by my extroversion towards the concerns of the Coledge, and greate persute after curious bookes I had lost much of the assiet and firmnesse of mynde I had formerly.' His house being attacked by an angry mob, he 'escaped by leaping my yard dyke, and lying in the braes at the foot yrof,' went south to London, kissed the hand of James II, and 'gave myself enteerely to devotion.' But less than three months later, falling ill, and reflecting on his position, he began to regret his hasty decision ('though I joined in the simplicity of my heart'), apparently for political rather than for theological reasons. 'I perceaved also the whole people of England was under a violent restraint then, and I foirsaw they would overturne the Government; the Jesuites, who had the greatest influence at court, pressing the King to illegal and unaccountable undertakings, and opposing the takeing of the alledgiance which I was bound to, by oaths. Upon which considerations, I repented of my rashnesse, and resolved to come home and returne to the church I was born in.' Inevitably 'I after this made not only those of the Romish Church my Enemies, but many Protestants too'; but it is evident that just as his conversion was effected without thought of consequences, his recantation sprang from dis-

illusionment, not mere expediency. He seems to have been a simple soul, incapable of dissimulation.

Since Mr Hett's list of the works of Sibbald is by no means complete, some notable omissions may well be given here:

1705. *De Gestis Illustrissimi Herois Gulielmi Vallæ Scotiæ olim Custodis, Collectanea Vana*. In his *Historia Literaria Gentis Scotorum* (MS. in Advocates' Library) he claims the historical notes in this compilation.

1706. *Introductio ad Historiam Rerum a Romanis Gestarum*.

1707. *The History and Description of Stirlingshire, Ancient and Modern*.

1710. *The History of Fife and Kinross*.

A controversial *Letter from Sir R—t S—d to Dr Archibald Pitcairne*. Edinburgh, 1709, was not by him, its real author being apparently a London physician, William Cockburn.

G. B.

In *Shilling Shockers of the Gothic School. A Study of Chapbook Gothic Romances* (Harvard Honors Theses in English, v. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1932. 54 pp. 7s. 6d.) Mr William A. Watt has written an entertaining little essay, appropriately illustrated by two 'elegant engravings' from the chapbooks themselves. It would be difficult to treat otherwise than lightly these abridgements and imitations, which exaggerated the machinery and characters of the Gothic novel to a degree of absurdity of which Mr Watt has taken full advantage in his quotations. Yet they enable us, as he points out, 'to study the unadorned elements of English Gothicism on which the novels were actually based'; and historically they form an important step between the long Gothic romances and the short tales of terror in the nineteenth century.

D. B.

Studies in English by Members of University College, Toronto, collected by Principal M. W. Wallace (Toronto: University of Toronto Press; London: H. Milford. 1931. 254 pp. 12s. 6d.), includes six essays on eighteenth and nineteenth-century literature. In *Swift's View of Poetry* Mr Herbert Davis seeks to show that Swift is 'the most extreme example in England of reaction against the heroic or romantic view of the poet's function and art' (p. 9), but he does not always distinguish clearly between attacks on poetic cant and attacks on poetry itself: it is, for example, not Denham's famous line but the mimicry of it that Swift cannot bear (pp. 33–4). Mr A. S. P. Woodhouse gives an interesting account of *Collins and the Creative Imagination*, interpreting Collins' *Ode on the Poetical Character* as 'an allegory whose subject is the creative imagination' (p. 60, a more satisfactory explanation than that put forward by Mr Garrod), showing how Collins' practice illustrates Joseph Warton's theory, and putting both theory and practice into their due historical perspective. Mr J. R. MacGillivray examines *The Pantisocracy Scheme and its Immediate Background*, proving the scheme to have been based on the accounts of Thomas Cooper and of J. P. Brissot, who had been sent out by the banker Clavière to report, among other things, on

the possibility of forming an ideal state in America (p. 138). In *Inhibitions of Browning's Poetry* Mr J. F. Macdonald tries to show that Browning's preference for the dramatic monologue and his dislike of speaking in his own person were due to 'his irritation of spirit at not being able to justify his faith to his reason' (p. 219). In the two remaining essays Mr G. S. Brett treats of *Shelley's Relation to Berkeley and Drummond*, while Mr E. K. Brown traces the history of *The French Reputation of Matthew Arnold* and finds reasons for its soundness and its slightness.

H. W. H.

Mr Jethro Bithell has in his *Germany: a Companion to German Studies* (London: Methuen. xii + 423 pp. 15s.) edited a volume of a kind which has been popular in Germany in recent years. It provides a general introduction to German culture, and Mr Bithell has enlisted in his service some of our leading authorities in this country. Its scope covers, besides literature, an introductory chapter by Mr Bithell himself on 'The Country, its Language and its Thought,' 133 pages dealing with German history by Miss Kathleen M. Gadd, Mr W. H. Hudson and Mr Hugh Quigley; and there are chapters on German art by Mrs Hanna Closs and Mr Martin S. Briggs, and on German music by Mr Edwin Evans. German achievement in science does not come within the range of the volume.

Of this varied fare the *Modern Language Review* is mainly interested in the chapters on German literature. The earliest period is dealt with by Professor W. E. Collinson, the great age of German poetry in two chapters by Professors F. E. Sandbach and L. A. Willoughby, and the most recent period, from 1880 to the present day, by the editor. The difficulty of editing a collection of studies of this kind lies in the sort of reader for whom it caters. In his Preface Mr Bithell says that he wishes to supply the needs of 'serious students' in respect of 'what is required for examinations and other purposes,' and of 'travellers in Germany'; but he seems, in this double purpose, to fall between two stools. I can hardly think that Professor Collinson's solid discussion of linguistic questions in his chapter will appeal to the traveller in Germany, and it is equally difficult to see how the student will derive much benefit from the other literary chapters. Brevity was, no doubt, essential; but the brevity has not been fairly imposed on the contributors. The great contribution of Germany to the literary treasure house of Europe, in which students are naturally most interested, has been condensed into two chapters of fourteen and sixteen pages, and so stringently condensed that the authors are often obliged to restrict themselves to names and titles, while the last fifty years, when German writers have contributed comparatively little to the imaginative wealth or the gaiety of nations, are discussed in eighty-nine. Gerhart Hauptmann alone receives more pages than all the great poets of Germany together. Goethe's share is, I reckon, just about four! The book is intended to be 'modern'; this feature is stressed. But it is difficult to see what good purpose is effected by resuscitating forgotten authors of the thirty years before the war, or discussing at length the ephemeral books that happen to be popular at the moment, when it

has meant the curtailment of all that really makes the study of Germany's literature an enrichment of our spiritual life. I fear the 'serious student,' even if he has only the modest aim of passing examinations in view, is badly served.

J. G. R.

Dr Kenneth C. Hayens has given us an exceedingly interesting book on Grimmelshausen, the greatest German novelist of the seventeenth century (*St Andrews University Publications*, xxxiv. London: H. Milford, 1933. 252 pp. 10s.). The literary presentation of the theme is attractive and will commend the book even to the 'general' reader who may never even have heard of Grimmelshausen's name. I recall particularly the vivid picture of Germany in the Thirty Years' War, and especially the careful analyses of Grimmelshausen's works. The specialist of the period, too, will welcome these, for few can pretend to such complete familiarity with Grimmelshausen's writings as Dr Hayens possesses. It is surprising, however, that, wide as his reading has been, the most important contribution to our knowledge of Grimmelshausen's life—and notably to the precise determination of how much is fact and how much fiction in his *Simplicissimus*—which has appeared in recent years. G. Kónnecke's two large volumes, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Lebensgeschichte Grimmelshausens*, Weimar, 1926–28, appears to have escaped him. Should he have the opportunity of a second edition, a good deal in his volume might with the help of Kónnecke be expanded and modified.

J. G. R.

A Miscellany of Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures presented to Leon E. Kastner (edited by Mary Williams and James A. de Rothschild. Cambridge: Heffer, 1932. xii + 576 pp. 27s. 6d.), in its rich variety of contents, is a worthy tribute to a veteran scholar whose own work has illumined many diverse fields of the subject. It would be invidious to single out any individual article, where forty-nine specialists from Great Britain, Ireland, the United States of America, France, Italy, Spain, Germany and Switzerland have contributed, and the themes treated range chronologically from Geoffrey of Monmouth and 'the matter of Britain' to Maurice Barrès and *Un jardin sur l'Oronte*. Mediæval texts, Renaissance and modern literary criticism, folklore and popular poetry, grammatical and dialectal questions, all find due place. One of the chief contributors is no longer with us. Vincenzo Crescini died in June 1932; his important article in the present volume, 'Broder, Guaz' (a discussion of a much disputed passage in the famous sirventese of Peire de la Cavarana), closed his laborious life: a last testimony to that keen interest and critical insight in the problems of Provençal poetry which are so notably shared by Professor Kastner himself.

E. G. G.

Professor Letterio di Francia is an indefatigable researcher into literary sources and popular traditions, a devoted student of the folklore motives in the 'fiaba' and the 'novella.' In his latest work, *La leggenda di Turandot nella novellistica e nel teatro* (Trieste: Casa Editrice

'La Vedetta Italiana.' 1932. 202 pp. L. 10), he reviews the story of Turandot from its remote Persian source, through its various forms and reflections in European literatures and popular tales, down to its renovation with the music of Puccini. Naturally the most interesting pages are those dealing with the 'fiaba cinese teatrale tragicomica' of Carlo Gozzi, of which we are given an illuminating critical appreciation. The author has even a good word to say for Giuseppe Giacosa's transformation of the legend into a sentimental drama of mediæval Italy in the *Trionfo d'Amore*. Included in the volume is a study of the sixteenth-century 'novella' of Luigi Alamanni, *La Contessa di Tolosa*, in the light of popular tradition, Professor di Francia showing, by a close comparison of similar motives, that the source was oral and almost certainly Italian rather than French.

E. G. G.

The old dictionary by F. D. Falcucci is known to be defective and obsolete, and a reliable dictionary of the Corsican dialect is long overdue. Father Tommaso Alfonsi in his *Il dialetto corso nella parlata Balanina* (Livorno: R. Giusti. 1932. xxiii + 197 pp. L. 18) has endeavoured to provide a list of the purely dialectal forms in use in the region of Balagna, giving their Italian and often also their French equivalents. Owing to his residence in Italy, in composing this work he has had occasionally to draw upon memory, and he is well aware that lack of daily contact with his fellow-countrymen may somewhat detract from the authoritative-ness of his book; but it needs no more than a cursory comparison to show that it constitutes a great advance on Falcucci's work, particularly when it is realised that he has purposely omitted all such words and forms as show no discrepancy from the Tuscan usage. Philologists may feel that the author would have been better advised if he had considered the Corsican vocabulary in itself, and avoided the constant comparison with what he calls 'la lingua.' He has prefaced his vocabulary by an informative note on the morphology and phonology of this section of the Corsican dialect; and it is a useful note despite Father Alfonsi's lack of specialised training, for he provides some excellent materials on which to base a scientific study; and he makes good his philological deficiencies by his obvious love for his native language. As the thoughts of an aging man turn to the land and the events of his youth, Father Alfonsi's linger affectionately on the words and sounds which he was wont to use when residing in his native island.

C. F.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

November 1932—March 1933

GENERAL.

- ARNOLD, R. F., *Reden und Studien*. Vienna, W. Braumuller. 7 M. 50.
- BALLY, CH., *Linguistique générale et linguistique française*. Paris, E. Leroux. 65 fr.
- BRIGHTFIELD, M. F., *The Issue in Literary Criticism*. Berkeley, Cal., Univ. of California Press; Cambridge, Univ. Press. 22s.
- CHADWICK, H. M., and N. F. CHADWICK, *The Growth of Literature*. i. *The Ancient Literatures of Europe*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 30s.
- CLARK, R., *Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal, being an account of the Connections between the British Isles and the Jansenists of France and Holland*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 18s.
- Essays by Divers Hands, Being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*. New Series. xi. London, H. Milford. 7s.
- Festgabe Philipp Strauch zum 80. Geburtstage*. Herausg. von G. Baesecke und F. J. Schneider. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 8 M.
- GRAFF, W. L., *Language and Languages*. London, Appleton. 18s.
- Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*. xiv. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 13s.
- STROH, F., *Sprache und Volk*. Giessen, Von Munchow.
- Year's Work in Modern Language Studies*, The. iii. Ed. by W. J. Entwistle. London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

- MEYER-LÜBKE, W., *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3te Aufl. Lief. x, xi. Heidelberg, C. Winter. Each 2 M. 50.
- TRAGER, G. L., *The Use of the Latin Demonstratives ille and ipse up to 600 A.D. as the Source of the Romance Article*. New York, Institute of French Studies. \$1.50.

Italian.

- BARETTI, G., *La Frusta letteraria*, a cura di L. Piccioni. i, ii. (Scrittori d'Italia, 138, 139.) Bari, Laterza. L. 70.
- BOCCACCIO, G., *Il Decamerone*. Edizione integra, con prefazione e glossario di A. Ottolini. Milan, Hoepli. L. 16.
- BOTTIGLIONI, G., *Atlante linguistico etnografico italiano della Corsica*. Pisa, L' Italia dialettale.
- CROCE, B., *Conversazioni critici*. 2 vols. Bari, Laterza. L. 60.
- DANTE ALIGHIERI, *The Divine Comedy*. The Italian text with a Translation by M. B. Anderson. (World's Classics, 392-394.) 3 vols. London, H. Milford. 6s.
- DANTE ALIGHIERI, *The Paradiso*. With a Translation by G. L. Bickersteth. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.
- GIANNOTTI, D., *Lettere a Piero Vettori*. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 25.
- Golden Book of Italian Poetry*, The. Chosen and edited by L. de Bosis. London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.

- LEIGH, G., *The Passing of Beatrice. A Study in the Heterodoxy of Dante.* London, Faber and Faber. 10s. 6*d.*
- ONDIS, L. A., *Phonology of the Cilentian Dialect* New York, Institute of French Studies \$1.25.
- PALGEN, R., *Das Quellenproblem der Gotthichen Komodie.* Heidelberg, C. Winter. 1 M 25.
- SALIS, J. R. DE, *Sismondi, 1733-1842.* Paris, H. Champion.
- SARDI, FRA TOMMASO, *De anima peregrina.* Ed. by M. Rooke. (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, xiii, 1-4.) Northampton, Mass., Smith College. \$3.
- SGROI, C., *Gli studi estetici in Italia nel primo trentennio del '900.* Florence, La nuova Italia. L. 12
- SMITH, W., *Italian Actors of the Renaissance.* New York, Coward and McCann. \$3.50.
- WHITING, M. B., *Dante and his Poetry.* London, G. G. Harrap. 3s. 6*d.*

Spanish.

- AHERNE, H., *El Romanticismo en España.* Cork, Univ. Press. 2s. 6*d.*
- CORBATÓ, H., *Los misterios del Corpus de Valencia* (Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology, xvi, 1) Berkeley, Cal., Univ. of California Press. \$2.25.
- ENTWISTLE, W. J., *The Scope of Spanish Studies. Inaugural Lecture.* Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1s.
- KENNEDY, R. L., *The Dramatic Art of Moreto* (Smith College Studies, xiii, 1-4.) Northampton, Mass. \$3. (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis.)
- LEAVITT, S. E., *Hispano-American Literature in the United States. A Bibliography of Translations and Criticism.* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 4s. 6*d.*
- PEERS, E. A., *The Study of Spanish Romanticism* (Presidential Address, Mod. Humanities Research Association). 1s.
- QUEVEDO, F. G. DE, *Obras completas II. Obras en verso. Textos refundidos por L. Astrana Marín.* Madrid, Aguilar. 50 pes.
- TRACHMAN, S. E., *Cervantes' Women of Literary Tradition.* New York, Instituto de las Españas.

French.

(a) *General (including Linguistic).*

- ANDERSON, J. G., *Le Mot juste; an Anglo-French Lexicon.* London, Dent. 15s.
- KELLENBERGER, H., *The Influence of Accentuation on French Word Order* (Elliott Monographs, xxx). Princeton, Univ. Press. \$1.
- RAMEAU, M., et H. YVON, *Dictionnaire des Anonymes ou Contraires.* Paris, Delagrave.
- VERRIER, P., *Le vers français: formes primitives, développement, diffusion.* 3 tomes. Paris, H. Didier.

(b) *Old French.*

- DARMESTETER, A., et D. S. BLONDHEIM, *Les Gloses françaises dans les Commentaires talmudiques de Raschl.* I. Paris, H. Champion.
- FAWTIER, R., *La chanson de Roland. Étude historique.* Paris, Boccard. 15 fr.
- FÖRSTER, W., *Wörterbuch zu Kristian von Troyes' Samtlichen Werken.* 2te Aufl. von H. Breuer. (Romanische Bibliothek, xxi.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 8 M.

- GIRAULT, F., *The Tale of Gargantua and King Arthur. The French Original of a lost Elizabethan Translation.* Ed. by H. Brown. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8s.
- GROBER, G., *Geschichte der mittelfranzösischen Literatur.* I. 2te Aufl. bearbeitet von S. Hofer. Berlin, W. de Gruyter. 13 M.
- LEVY, R., *Recherches lexicographiques sur d'anciens textes français d'origine juive* (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages. Extra vol. v). Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins Press; London, H. Milford. 14s. 6d.
- MARTIAL D'AUVERGNE, *Les arrêts d'amour.* Herausg. von L. Gotz. (Frankfurter Quellen und Forschungen zur germanischen und romanischen Philologie. 1) Frankfurt a. M., M. Diesterweg. 4 M. 40.
- PEI, M. A., *The Language of the Eighth-Century Texts in Northern France* (College of the City of New York).
- VORETZSCH, K., *Altfranzösisches Lesebuch.* 2te Aufl. (Sammlung kurzer Lehrbücher der roman. Sprachen und Literaturen, VII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 8 M.
- (c) *Modern French.*
- BAUDIN, M., *Les Bâtards au Théâtre en France de la Renaissance à la fin du XVIII^e siècle* (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, XXI). Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins Press; London, H. Milford. \$1.25.
- BRAY, R., *Chronologie du Romantisme (1804-30)* (Bibliothèque de la Revue des Cours et Conférences). Paris, Boivin. 15 fr.
- BRUMMER, R., *Studien zur französischen Aufklärungsliteratur im Anschluss an J. A. Naigeon* (Sprache und Kultur der germanisch-romanischen Völker, C. XI). Breslau, Priebsch. 10 M.
- CHATEAUBRIAND, *Les Natchez.* Publiés avec introduction et notes par G. Chinard. Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins Press; London, H. Milford. 21s. 6d.
- CONDORCET, M. J. DE, *Esquisse d'un tableau historique des Progrès de l'Esprit humain.* Éd. par O. H. Prior. Paris, Boivin. 20 fr.
- DECAHORS, E., *Maurice de Guérin. Essai de biographie psychologique.* Paris, Bloud. 48 fr.
- DITCHY, J. K., *Les Acadiens Louisianais et leur Parler.* Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins Press; London, H. Milford. 15s. 6d.
- DROUOT, E., *Un chapitre de la vie de Lamartine.* Paris, J. Gamber. 15 fr.
- DUREL, L. C., *L'Œuvre d'André Mareschal, Auteur de la période de Louis XIII* (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, XXII). Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins Press; London, H. Milford. \$1.25.
- EHRHARD, J., *Le roman français depuis M. Proust.* Paris, Nouv. Revue critique. 12 fr.
- FAGUET, E., *Histoire de la poésie française. VI. De Boileau à Voltaire, 1700-1720.* Paris, Boivin. 15 fr.
- FOURNET, CH., *Un Genevois cosmopolite, ami de Lamartine: Huber-Saladin* (Bibliothèque de la Revue de litt. comparée, LXXXIII). Paris, H. Champion. 45 fr.
- French Romantic Poetry: an Anthology.* Ed. by W. L. Schwartz. London, Harper.
- HARRIS, J., *Lamartine et le peuple.* Paris, J. Gamber. 35 fr.
- HAWKINS, R. L., *Newly Discovered French Letters.* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. \$3.
- IACUZZI, A., *The European Vogue of Favart.* New York, Institute of French Studies. \$2.75.

- KLEMPERER, V., *P. Corneille* (Epochen der französischen Literatur, iii, 1). Munich, Hueber. 5 M. 50.
- MALLARMÉ, S., *La dernière mode*. With Introduction by S. A. Rhodes. New York, Institute of French Studies.
- MOREAU, P., *Le romantisme, 1800-56* (Histoire de la littérature française, viii). Paris, I. de Gigard. 60 fr.
- NOSS, M. T., *La sensibilité de Boileau*. Paris, J. Gamber. 25 fr.
- PASCOE, M. E., *Les drames religieux du milieu du xviiie siècle*. Paris, Boivin.
- PAYR, B., *Th. Gautier und E. T. A. Hoffmann* (Romanische Studien, xxxiii). Berlin, E. Ebering. 3 M. 60
- PEYRE, H., *Bibliographie critique de l'Hellénisme en France de 1843 à 1870*. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 15s. 6d.
- PEYRE, H., *Louis Ménard (1822-1901)* (Yale Romanic Studies, v). New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 20s.
- PIERRE-QUINT, L., *A. Gide: sa vie et ses œuvres*. Paris, Stock. 18 fr.
- REESINK, H. J., *L'Angleterre et la littérature anglaise dans les trois plus anciens périodiques français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709* (Bibliothèque de la Revue de littérature comparée, lxxvii). Paris, H. Champion. 90 fr.
- ROCHEFOUCAULD, F. DE LA, *A Frenchman in England, 1784*. Translated by S. C. Roberts. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.
- ROOSBROECK, G. L. VAN, *Persian Letters before Montesquieu*. New York, Institute of French Studies.
- TILLEY, A., *Three French Dramatists: Racine, Marivaux, Musset*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.
- TRAHARD, P., *Les maîtres de la sensibilité française au xviiiie siècle*. III. Paris, Boivin. 30 fr.
- TREMBLAY, N., *La critique littéraire d'Edmond Scherer*.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

- BARBER, C. C., *Die vorgeschichtliche Betonung der germanischen Substantiva und Adjektiva* (Indogermanische Bibliothek, iii, 12). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 9 M.
- DAL, I., *Die germanischen Pronominalkasus mit N-Formans* (Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II, ii). Oslo, Dybwad. 2 kr. 75.
- KRAUSE, W., *Beiträge zur Runenforschung* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, ix, 2). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 4 M.

Gothic.

- METLEN, M., *Does the Gothic Bible represent Idiomatic Gothic?* Abstract of a Dissertation. Chicago, Ill.

Scandinavian.

- BULMAN, J., *Strindberg and Shakespeare*. London, J. Cape. 6s.
- HERMANNSSON, H., *Sæmund Sigfússon and the Oddaverjar* (Islandica, xxii). Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Library; London, H. Milford. \$1.
- LACHMANN, V., *Das Alter der Harðarsaga* (Palaestra, clxxxiii). Leipzig, Mayer und Müller. 14 M.
- SCHÜCK, H., och K. WARBURG, *Illustrerad svensk litteraturhistoria*. 3. uppl. VII. (Den nya tiden, 1870-1914 av G. Castrén.) Stockholm, H. Geber. 30 kr.

English.

(a) *General (including Linguistic).*

- BENSE, J. F., *A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary.* III. The Hague, M. Nijhoff; London, H. Milford. 16s.
- Bibliography of English Language and Literature, Annual. XII. 1931. Ed. by M. S. Serjeantson, assisted by L. N. Broughton. Cambridge, Bowes and Bowes. 7s. 6d.
- BREBNER, J. D., and E. NEFF, *A Bibliography of English Literary History.* New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 3s.
- DIETH, E., *A Grammar of the Buchan Dialect (Aberdeenshire).* I. Cambridge, Heffer. 12s. 6d.
- FLASDIECK, H. M., *Studien zur schriftsprachlichen Entwicklung der neuenglischen Velarvokale in Verbindung mit 'r.'* Halle, M. Niemeyer. 12 M.
- GRANT, W., *The Scottish National Dictionary.* I, II. Edinburgh, Scottish Nat. Dictionary Assoc.
- HARVEY, SIR P., *The Oxford Companion to English Literature.* Oxford, Clarendon Press. 15s.
- LITTLE, W., H. W. FOWLER, J. COULSON, and C. T. ONIONS, *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary.* 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 63s.
- Studies in English.* XII. (Univ. of Texas Bulletin.) Austin, Texas, Univ. of Texas. \$1.
- ZACHERISSON, R. E., *English Place-Name Puzzles.* Uppsala, Lundquist. 3 kr. 50.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

- BROWN, CARLETON, *English Lyrics of the 13th Century.* Oxford, Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d.
- CAXTON, W., *The Book of Fayttes of Armes and of Chyualrye*, translated and printed by (Early English Text Society, No. 189). London, H. Milford. 21s.
- Exeter Book of Old English Poetry*, The. With Introductory Chapters by R. W. Chambers, Max Förster and Robin Flower. London, P. Lund, Humphries and Co. £10. 10s.
- HOOPS, J., *Kommentar zum Beowulf.* Heidelberg, C. Winter. 8 M.
- KRAPP, G. P., *The Paris Psalter and the Meters of Boethius (Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, v).* New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, G. Routledge. 18s.
- KRAUSS, R., H. BRADY, and C. R. CASE, *Three Chaucer Studies.* New York, Oxford Univ. Press; London, H. Milford.
- Pearl, ed. by Members of Bowdoin College. Boston, B. Humphries. \$1.50.
- Pearl, The, *Rendered in Modern Verse* by S. P. Chase. New York: Oxford Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.
- SCHNELL, E., *Die Traktate des Richard Rolle von Hampole 'Incendium Amoris' und 'Emendatio Vitae' und deren Übersetzung durch Richard Misyn (Erlangen Dissertation).*
- Siege of Jerusalem*, The. Ed. by E. Kolbing and M. Day. (Early English Text Society, No. 188.) London, H. Milford. 15s.
- Vulgaria of John Stanbridge*, The, and the *Vulgaria of Robert Whittinton*. Ed. by B. White. (Early Engl. Text Society, No. 187.) London, H. Milford. 12s.
- WELLS, J. E., *Fifth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400.* New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. \$1.50.

(c) *Modern English.*

- American Prose, *The Oxford Book of* Ed. by M. van Doren. London, H. Milford. 12s. 6d.
- ANDERS, H., *Die Bedeutung Wordsworthscher Gedankengänge für das Denken und Dichten von J. Keats* (Beiträge zur Anglistik). Breslau, Trewendt und Granier. 2 M. 40.
- ARNOLD, M., *Letters to A. H. Clough*. Ed. by H. F. Lowry. London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.
- AUSTEN, J., *Letters to her Sister Cassandra and others* Ed. by R. W. Chapman. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 42s.
- BABBITT, I., *On Being Creative and other Essays*. London, Constable. 7s. 6d.
- BAKER, J. E., *The Novel and the Oxford Movement*. Princeton, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 11s.
- BLUNDEN, E., *Leigh Hunt: a Biography*. London, Cobden-Sanderson. 7s. 6d.
- BOND, R. P., *English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750* (Harvard Studies in English, vi) Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 20s.
- BOURL'HONNE, P., *George Eliot: Essai de biographie intellectuelle et morale, 1819-54*. Paris, H. Champion.
- BRADBY, G. F., *The Brontës and Other Essays*. London, H. Milford. 5s.
- BRUESTLE, B. S., *The 'Fool of Nature' in the English Drama of our Day* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis).
- BUSH, D., *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry*. Minneapolis, Univ. of Minnesota Press; London, H. Milford. 24s.
- CHAPMAN, J. A., *Papers on Shakespeare*. i. *Hamlet*. Bombay, Oxford Univ. Press. 2s.
- CHRISTY, A., *The Orient in American Transcendentalism: a Study of Emerson, Thoreau and Alcott*. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 26s. 6d.
- CLARK, C., *Shakespeare and National Character*. London, Hamlyn. 10s. 6d.
- CRAWFORD, A. W., *The Genius of Keats*. London, A. H. Stockwell. 6s.
- DAVIS, B. E. C., *Edmund Spenser. A Critical Study*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.
- DEERING, A., *Sir Samuel Ferguson, Poet and Antiquarian* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis).
- DRINKWATER, J., *Shakespeare*. London, Duckworth. 2s.
- DRYDEN, J., *The Songs of*. Ed. by C. L. Day. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 14s.
- DUNBAR, W., *The Poems of*. Ed. by W. M. Mackenzie. Edinburgh, Porpoise Press. 12s. 6d.
- ECKEL, J. C., *The First Editions of the Writings of Charles Dickens. A Bibliography*. London, Maggs. 63s.
- ELLEHAUGE, M., *English Restoration Drama*. London, Williams and Norgate. 6s.
- ELTON, O., *R. Bridges and The Testament of Beauty* (English Assoc. Pamphlets, lxxxiii). London, H. Milford. 2s.
- FAUSSET, H. F. A., *The Lost Leader: a Study of Wordsworth*. London, J. Cape. 12s. 6d.
- FOSS, G. R., *What the Author (Shakespeare) meant*. London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.
- GATES, W. B., *The Dramatic Works and Translations of Sir William Lower, with a Reprint of 'The Enchanted Lovers'* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis).
- GREG, W. W., *English Literary Autographs, 1550-1650*. III. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

- GUHA, P. K., *Tragic Relief*. London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.
- HAVILAND, T. P., *The 'Roman de longue haleine' on English Soil* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis).
- HAWTHORNE, H., *Romantic Rebel: the Story of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. London, Appleton. 8s. 6d.
- HAWTHORNE, N., *The American Notebooks*. Ed. by R. Stewart. New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 30s.
- JAMES, R. D., *Old Drury of Philadelphia* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis).
- JOHNSON, S., *Unpublished Letters to and from*. Ed. by J. D. Wright. Manchester, Univ. Press. 2s.
- KNIGHT, G. W., *The Shakespearian Tempest*. London, H. Milford. 12s. 6d.
- Literary Friendships of the Age of Wordsworth*. An Anthology. Ed. by R. C. Bald. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- LODGE, T., and GREENE, R., *A Looking-Glass for London and England, 1594*. Ed. by W. W. Greg. (Malone Society Reprints.)
- LOTSPEICH, H. G., *Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser*. Princeton, Princeton University Press; London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.
- MANN, W., *Drydens heroische Tragodien als Ausdruck hofischer Barockkultur in England* (Tubingen Dissertation).
- MARSHALL, D., *Sir Walter Scott and Scots Law*. Edinburgh, W. Hodge. 6s.
- Mary of Nimmegen*. A Facsimile Reproduction of the Copy of the English Version in the Huntington Library. Ed. by H. M. Ayres and A. J. Barnouw. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 13s.
- MASSINGER, P., *The Great Duke of Florence*. Ed. by J. M. Stockholm. Baltimore, J. H. Furst.
- MASSINGHAM, H. J., *The Friend of Shelley: A Memoir of E. J. Trelawney*. London, Cobden-Sanderson. 7s. 6d.
- MÉGROZ, R. L., *Modern English Poetry, 1882-1932*. London, Nicholson and Watson. 8s. 6d.
- MILTON, J., *Works*. Ed. by F. A. Patterson and others. vii, x. New York, Columbia Univ. Press.
- Milton, The Early Lives of*. Ed. by H. Darbishire. London, Constable. 18s.
- Oxford Book of 16th Century Verse*. Ed. by Sir E. K. Chambers. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 8s. 6d.
- PARTRIDGE, E., *Literary Sessions*. London, Scholartis Press. 7s. 6d.
- PERCY, TH., *Ancient Songs, chiefly on Moorish Subjects*. Ed. by D. Nichol Smith. London, H. Milford. 42s.
- PIOZZI, H. L., *Anecdotes of Samuel Johnson*. Ed. by S. C. Roberts. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3s. 6d.
- Poetical Rhapsody*, A. Ed. by H. E. Rollins. ii. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 24s. 6d.
- PROBST, L., *An Analytical Study of Shelley's Versification* (Univ. of Iowa Studies, v, 3). Univ. of Iowa. 75 c.
- RANKIN, D. S., *Kate Chopin and her Creole Stories* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis).
- Ratseis Ghost, or the Second Part of the Madde Prankes and Robberies*. (Facsimile.) Ed. by H. B. Charlton. Manchester, Univ. Press and Rylands Library. 6s.
- ROBERTS, W. W., *Ch. and Fanny Burney in the light of the New Thrale Correspondence*. Manchester, Univ. Press. 1s. 6d.
- ROBERTSON, J. G., *C. H. Herford* (Brit. Academy). London, H. Milford. 1s.

- ROBERTSON, J. M., *The Shakespearian Canon*. iv, 2. London, Routledge. 10s. 6d.
- ROBINSON, H. C., Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Lamb, etc. Ed. by E. J. Morley. Manchester, Univ. Press. 4s. 6d.
- ROLLINS, H. E., *The Pepys Ballads*. viii. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 21s. 6d.
- SAUL, G. B., A. E. Coppard. his Life and Poetry (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis).
- SCOTT, SIR W., *Letters, 1811-1814*. Ed. by H. J. C. Grierson, W. M. Parker and others. iii. London, Constable. 18s.
- SECHLER, R. P., *George Moore, a Disciple of Walter Pater* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis).
- Seventeenth-Century Studies by Members of the Graduate School of the University of Cincinnati*. Ed. by R. Shafer. Princeton, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 21s. 6d.
- Shakespeare, Aspects of*, by Various Authors (British Academy Lectures). London, H. Milford. 12s. 6d.
- Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*. LXVIII. Herausg. von W. Keller. Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 10 M.
- SIBBALD, SIR ROBERT, *Memoirs (1641-1722)*. Ed. by F. P. Hett. London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.
- SICKELS, E. M., *The Gloomy Egoist*. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 30s.
- SPENSER, E., *The Works*. Variorum Ed. By E. Greenlaw, C. G. Osgood, P. M. Padelford. i. Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins Press; London, H. Milford. 36s.
- SPINDLER, R., *Die Alpen in der englischen Literatur und Kunst (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, xxi)*. Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 2 M.
- STILLMAN, C. G., *Samuel Butler: a Mid-Victorian Modern*. London, M. Secker. 16s.
- STRUBLE, M. C., *A Johnson Handbook*. New York, F. S. Crofts.
- THRALE, H. L., *Three Dialogues*. Ed. by M. Zamick. Manchester, Univ. Press. 1s. 6d.
- THRALE, MRS. and DR JOHNSON, *French Journals of*. Ed. by M. Tyson and H. Guppy. Manchester, Univ. Press. 15s.
- VULLIAMY, C. E., *James Boswell*. London, Bles. 10s. 6d.
- WATT, W. W., *Shilling Shockers of the Gothic School*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.
- WERNER, D. L., *The Idea of Union in American Verse (1776-1878)* (Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis).
- WOLFE, H., *Life of Shelley*. 2 vols. London, Dent. 15s.
- YEAMSLY, M. L., *The Sanity of Hamlet*. London, J. Bale and Danielsson. 6s.

German.

(a) *German (including Linguistic)*.

- LOEWENTHAL, F., *Bibliographisches Handbuch zur deutschen Philologie*. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 10 M. 50
- MAXWELL, W. C., *Reinwortuntersuchungen im Deutschen*. Dissertation. Heidelberg, C. Winter.
- PAUL, H., *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Bearbeitet von K. Euling. Lief. 1. Halle, M. Niemeyer. Each 2 M.

(b) *Old and Middle High German*.

- GENNRICH, F., *Grundriss einer Formenlehre des mittelalterlichen Liedes*. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 16 M.

- GOTTFRIED VON NEIFEN, *Die Lieder*. Herausg. von M. Haupt; neue Ausgabe von E. Schroder. Berlin, Weidmann 2 M. 40.
- GOTTING, F., *Der Renner Hugos von Trimberg* (Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung, 1). Munster, Aschendorff. 4 M.
- HEINRICH VON MURGUS, *Der Seele Rat*. Herausg. von F. Rosenfeld. (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, xxxvii.) Berlin, Weidmann. 13 M.
- RATHEKE, K., *Dietmar von Aist* (Form und Geist, xxviii). Leipzig, Eichblatt. 5 M.
- SINGER, S., *Die religiöse Lyrik des Mittelalters*. Bern, Francke. 4 M. 40.
- WOLFRAM D'ESCHENBACH, *Parzival*. Introduction, traduction et notes de M. Wilmotte. Paris, Renaissance du livre. 5 fr. 50.

(c) *Modern German.*

- ARENS, E., und K. SCHULTE-KEMMINGHAUSEN, *Droste-Bibliographie* (Veröffentlichungen der Annette von Droste-Gesellschaft, ii). Munster, Aschendorff. 8 M.
- BERGMANN, A., *Das Welt-Echo des Goethe-Jahres*. Weimar, H. Bohlau. 6 M.
- BOHM, W., *Faust der Nichtfaustische*. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 5 M. 60.
- BOYD, J., *Goethe's Knowledge of English Literature*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- BURGIN, H., *Der Minister Goethe vor der römischen Reise*. Weimar, H. Bohlau. 9 M. 60.
- CAST, G. C., *Das Motiv der Vererbung im deutschen Drama des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Univ. of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, xxxiii). Madison, Univ. of Wisconsin.
- Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen*. xvii, 5. Romantik, herausg. von P. Kluckhohn. Politische Dichtung, II (1795-1815), herausg. von R. F. Arnold. Leipzig, Ph. Reclam. Each 7 M. 50.
- Deutscher Horaz in fünf Jahrhunderten*. Herausg. von R. Newald. (Literarhistorische Bibliothek, v.) Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 4 M. 80.
- ELOESSER, A., *Modern German Literature*. Transl. by C. A. Phillips. London, H. Hamilton. 15s.
- FAESI, R., *Spittlers Weg und Werk* (Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben, xx). Frauenfeld, Huber. 10 M.
- FORST DE BATTAGLIA, O., *Johann Nestroy*. Leipzig, Staackmann. 5 M.
- FRUHM, TH., *Gedanken über Goethes Weltliteratur*. Leipzig, Helmg. 6 M.
- GILLIES, A., *Herder und Ossian* (Neue Forschungen, xix). Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt.
- GOERTZ, H., *Frankreich und Erlebnis der Form im Werke R. M. Rilkes*. Stuttgart, Metzler. 6 M.
- GOETHE, J. W. VON, *Gedichte in zeitgeschichtlicher Auswahl*. Herausg. von Ph. Witkop. Stuttgart, Strecker und Schroder.
- Goethe Centenary at the University of Wisconsin*, The. Ed. by A. R. Hohlfield. (Univ. of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, xxxiv.) Madison, Wis.
- Goethe Centenary Papers*. (University of Chicago.) Ed. by M. Schutze. Chicago, Open Court. \$1.25.
- Goethe-Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch der*. Herausg. von M. Hecker. xviii. Weimar, Verlag der Goethe-Gesellschaft.
- GRAY, A., *Arrows: a Book of German Ballads and Folksongs attempted in Scots*. Edinburgh, Grant and Murray. 7s. 6d.
- HAUPTMANN, G., *Goethe* (Germanic Review Texts, iii). New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 3s.

- HAYENS, K. C., Grimmelshausen (St Andrews Univ. Publications, xxxiv). London, H. Milford. 10s.
- HEWETT-THAYER, H. W., An Anthology of German Literature in the 19th Century. Princeton, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 17s.
- HOFMANN, W., Stilgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Meisterliedern des Hans Folz (Germanische Studien, cxxxii). Berlin, Ebering. 5 M. 60.
- JACKEL, K., R. Wagner in der französischen Literatur. II. (Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und romanischen Völker, C. iii, 1.) Breslau, Priebatsch. 9 M.
- KEMMINGHAUSEN, K. S., Die niederdeutschen Marchen der Bruder Grimm (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für westfälische Landes- und Volkskunde, iii, 1). Münster, Aschendorff. 4 M.
- KOCH, F., Drei Goethe-Reden. Weimar, H. Bohlau. 2 M.
- KONITZER, W. F., Die Bedeutung des Schicksals bei Holderlin. Würzburg, K. Tritsch. 3 M.
- LIPTZIN, S., A. Schnitzler. New York, Prentice-Hall. \$2 50.
- MANN, O., Der junge Friedrich Schlegel (Neue Forschung, xvi). Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 10 M.
- METZER, F., Goethes Faust. Eine evangelische Auslegung. Berlin, Furche-Verlag. 6 M. 80.
- PRILL, V., Caroline de la Motte Fouqué (Germanische Studien, cxxxi). Berlin, Ebering. 3 M. 80.
- REHDER, H., Die Philosophie der unendlichen Landschaft: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der romantischen Weltanschauung (Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift, Buchreihe, xix) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 8 M.
- SIEBER, C., Die Jugend R. M. Rilkes. Leipzig, Inselverlag. 5 M.
- SPENGLER, W., Das Drama Schillers. Seine Genesis. (Von deutscher Poeterey, xiii.) Leipzig, J. J. Weber. 7 M. 60.
- VINANT, G., M. de Meysenbug, sa vie et ses amis (Bibliothèque de la Revue de littérature comparée, lxxxiii). Paris, H. Champion. 45 fr.
- WIEDERSICH, A., Frauengestalten G. Hauptmanns. Glatz, Bücherstube.
- ZELTER, C. F., Darstellungen seines Lebens. Herausg. von J. W. Schottlander. (Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft, xlv.) Weimar, Verlag der Goethe-Gesellschaft.

Owing to pressure on our advertisement pages the usual notice concerning the *Modern Language Review* has been omitted from this number.

The *Modern Language Review* is supplied to members of the Modern Humanities Research Association (and by a special arrangement to members of certain other Associations) at an annual subscription, payable in advance through the Treasurer of the body concerned, of 15s. (\$3.75).

Editorial communications of a general kind and contributions relating especially to Germanic languages and to English should be addressed for the present to Prof. Charles J. Sisson, University College, Gower Street, London, W.C. 1, and those which relate to the Romance languages to Prof. Edmund G. Gardner, 5 Ruskin Close, Meadway, London, N.W. 11. Books for review should be sent to the Editors of *The Modern Language Review*, University College, Gower Street, London, W.C. 1. Other business communications, and requests for advertising space, should be addressed to Prof. William C. Atkinson, The University, Glasgow.

THE POLITICAL 'DISLOYALTY' OF
THOMAS SOUTHERNE

THERE are three letters (hitherto unprinted in their entirety) in the State Papers at the Public Record Office which reveal the dramatist Thomas Southerne as one of that large company of writers who have changed their political opinions for the sake of personal gain. Southerne, moreover, did not scruple to turn informer.

In his early years he had been the most complete and unblemished of Tories. *The Loyal Brother*—his first play, written in 1682—was a thinly disguised political allegory which exalted James Duke of York at the expense of Shaftesbury and even of Charles. His efforts did not go altogether unrewarded, for at the death of Charles he entered the army with a commission and was received into the patronage of the Duke of Berwick. He rose to the command of a company, and then—at the Revolution—his military career came to an abrupt end. His political flatteries had been so ill-directed that he was forced to rely on the theatre for a living.

If the events of history had taken a different course, he would doubtless have continued his career as a dramatic laureate of the Tory party. In 1687, he tells us, he began writing *The Spartan Dame*. This was another allegory which was clearly intended to warn the audience of the consequences that would ensue if James II were deposed. Inevitably, there was considerable difficulty in obtaining permission for the play to be acted. In 1704 the Duke of Devonshire assured Southerne that it was perfectly harmless, but the first performance did not take place until 1719—and even then considerable sections were omitted.

There is some significance in the fact that in 1704 Southerne submitted his play to the approval of the Whiggish Duke of Devonshire. For in that year he gave overwhelming evidence that the Tory in him had yielded to the change of times. The first indication of this is given in the preface to Dennis's *Liberty Asserted*, in which the writer expresses himself grateful to Southerne for his personal guidance. The play is predominantly Whiggish in outlook, and Southerne, in assisting Dennis, would seem to have abandoned the Tory principles of his youth.

In the same month, however, as that in which *Liberty Asserted* was published, Southerne was writing the three letters which reveal him as the complete political time-server. Summaries of these are printed in the

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1703-4¹; here they are given in full from the originals in the Public Record Office:

(1)

to y^e honorable Robert Harley Speaker of y^e house of commons at his house in. york buildings in y^e strand.

most worthy sir

after yow haue perused y^e inclosed. pray communicat it to your worthy house. who I hope will find y^e contents so reasonable and consistent with y^e honor and intrest of a protestant gouern^t as to ioyn their supplications to her Majesty, with y^e Earl of Nottingham to whom yow will send y^e inclosed² after y^e house has seen it. I am, sir, Your honors most humble seru^t

Tho: Southern.

London march y^e first. 1703/4

tho the inclosed is long it deserues reading.

(2)

to y^e right honorable y^e Earl of Nottingham. Cheef Secretary of State to her sacred Majesty these humbly present.

my lord

can any man y^t has english blood in's Veins auoid blushing· y^t: in a crowd of 500 persons I coud enumerat come from france without leaue, since her Sacred Majesties happy reign; Jemmy Boucher y^e onely englishman of any³ note amgst them (who is and⁴ euer was a true english church of england man) shoud be singled out to make an example of. when soe many Irish. and Scotch Coll.s Majors Capt.s etc^{a:5} all papists⁶, lately come ouer, daily, appear in hords in publique Coffeehouse about Whitehall and St^t Jam^s: impudently bragging of their feats in france dureing y^e late warr. To come to particulars. how come Coll: Buttl-ler⁷ not to be so uiolently prosecuted as Bouc-cher⁸ was: is not he an Irish papist. and his bro: y^e lord of gellmoy who is⁹ marryed to y^e Lady Waldegraue y^e late K: J: daughter a lieft. general in france· He and Coll: poore came hither from france aboue 18: months agoe: the later

¹ Pp. 551, 551-3, 567.

² inclosed *inserted in margin*, Encl *in text*, deleted.

³ *Inserted above.*

⁵ *One word (undecipherable) deleted.*

⁷ *Divided between two lines, and followed by an indecipherable word.*

⁸ *Divided between two lines.*

⁴ euer deleted.

⁶ who deleted.

⁹ *Inserted above.*

indeed was committed to Newgate. but was dischargd soon after: how and upon what account I need not inform your Lop. Then he went for ireland upon no good design you may be sure. a man y^t went thither to list officers and men to be ready on y^e first occasions will not want¹ pretences and excuses whilst he's winked at. I doe not understand what lenity he can ex-pect² from an english protestant gouern^t: and y^t Boucher shoud at y^e same time be sacrificed: Coll Poore is and euer was an irish papist. allways bloody and inueterat agst y^e english nation and gouern^t and altho he is now here. his regiment is preserued and continued to him in france. his pay and pension punctually remitted to him to London. his wife and children now³ plentifuly^y prouided for at st germins by y^e french King; and I leaue your lop to guess; for what:—after he dispatch'd his priuat priuat⁴ comission in ireland. the papists of y^t Contry made a purse, and imployed this same fauorit Coll: to come to London as one of their cheef agents to oppose an act⁵ which y^e irish parliamt sent hither for approbation to preuent y^e growth of popery in irel^d and altho this man was a Coll. in all y^e last irish warr, and for 10. years after in france; and y^t he is outlawd in ireland, and y^t he has doubly forfeited his life by comeing clandestinely into england; yet Boucher is condemnd; and this irish fellow under the aboue qualifications, is now in London, and is daily at most of y^e offices at Court, im--pudently⁶ solliciting for his rebellious Contrymen. and walks, with a greater air of authority in⁷ st: iames park and about her mai^{ts}: Palace then any of y^e Coll^s of y^e guards doe: the pretence of discharging him before; was want of euidence—let not y^t serue now: for i doe hereby offer to produce seuerall persons, on his tryall to proue all that is here before recited: when he was in newgate before. if he was arraigned. no body knew y^e day: And if your lop wil get him now proceeded against. and make it known. yow shal haue wittnesses enof and then lett y^e world iudge⁸ which ought to be made an example of he or Jemmy Boucher:

Boucher euer more was a protestant. though great offers were made to him, if he woud change: he is an englishman. he neuer serued y^e french King. nor in his army, more than y^t he was a seruant for his bread to y^e Duke of barwick in his priuat family, and his being near him. has uery often saued y^e life of many an englishman. besides he re-leeued⁹ many of them in french prisons and kept others from starueing: as can be

¹ *Inserted above.*

³ *Inserted above.*

⁵ *One letter deleted.*

⁷ *in written over at, deleted.*

⁹ *Divided between two lines.*

² *Divided between two lines.*

⁴ *priuat repeated on next page.*

⁶ *Divided between two lines.*

⁸ *Inserted above.*

sufficiently uouched. and sure sure¹ my lord. such a man deserues greater mercy and fauor from a protestant gouern^t than this irish papist Coll who woud think it a iust meritorious act to draw y^e blood of euery protestant in england y^t he does not think to be for his party, and woud serue them so too², after makeing use of them and serueing him in his ends for shame then my lord. interpose, and if an example must be made, which i think necessary. let the irish papist be made y^e sacrifice: he is outlawd; serued and fought 15: years. agst y^e Crown: and poor boucher has no other crime than y^t of comeing with his children into his natiue Contry to preuent their being bred papists. I declare in y^e presence of god, I haue neither relation nor much acquaintance with Boucher. but methinks tho in strictness of law he is guilty, tis hard y^t y^{e3} onely english protestant who returnd with out⁴ leaue shoud be sacrificed. and y^t Coll: poor. and so many other noted men who actually bore arms agst y^e Crown shoud be winked. I wil, if yow bring Poor to a tryall get yow euidence enough of euery station he was in, in france and ireland. I writ three seuerall letters before this to your lop of this matter, and as i belieue by your takeing no notice of them. y^t they were kept from your sight. by some underlings. I send this to M^r Speeker of y^e house of commons, to com municat⁵ it to y^e house. in hopes they woud ioyn their supplications with your lop. to her sacred majesty about Boucher and to prosecut coll: Poor.—Coll: butler mentiond in y^e begining of my letter is in ireland listing officers and men priuatly. and y^e gouern^t there ought to be writt about him. and seuerall other Irish officers lately gon thither. I am my lord your lordsp most humble seruant.

Tho: Southern

March y^e first: 1703/4.

(3)

pray read all this letter. for although it is long it is uery necessary and fitt your lop shoud read it

my lord

the day after unfortunat Boucher was sentencd to dÿe. I writt to your lop. and inclosed it to the speaker of y^e house of y^e Commons, in hopes they woud ioyn with your lop⁶ in intercedeing to her Sacred

¹ sure repeated on next page.

³ Inserted above.

⁶ com municat divided between two lines.

² aft deleted.

⁴ with out divided between two lines.

⁵ Inserted above.

Majestie to saue the only protestant of note¹ whose zeal to lue under her Ma^{ts} gouerm^t: made him Commit a breach of y^e laws. Consider my lord he is an englishman. and a true church of england man, and guilty of no crime to her Majesty. but what was uery naturall in him. notwithstanding its being contrary to law: I am sure no man in y^e world woud fight more cheerefully for her Ma^{tie} than he woud. and specially agst france.

if to make an example be what y^e gouerm^t woud desire: I do once more offer your lop. to gett yow half a dozen creditable wittnesses agst Coll: Poor. Coll. Buttler Coll. macCarty. Capt. macGrayth. Capt. Holland Major Maxwell. and an² infinitt deale more of Irish. and Scotch papists, who are come ouer in swarms, and with an intent to doe mischief—all y^e officers aboue mentiond. haue their posts kept for them in france, and their pay. with pensions punctually remitted to them: and Coll. poor who is their chief is euery day at³ and about whitehall. and St James and has y^e impudence to own y^t he came lately⁴ from ireland to be agent at Court for y^e papists and to oppose y^e act to preuent y^e growth of popery in ireland.—Well then, might poor boucher, (who came ouer with a full design to serue y^e queen and doe france all y^e mischief he coud) think since Coll⁵ poor. &^{ca} were wink^d at who are all uiolent papists. that he might safely return⁶ to his natue Contry to serue his lawfull queen and soueraigne. and to educat his poor helpless babes in y^e true faith and feare of god. My Lord y^e queen will not take it ill that you woud intercede for this unfortunat englishman. if yow will be pleasd to re present⁷ those circumstances to her. matie: I protest I am hardly acquainted with Jemmy Boucher, nor haue I any sort of correspondence with him. or knowledge of s^s affairs. but what the publick papers giue.—nor woud I trouble yo^r lop with this but that this day's Courant⁹ mentions y^t he is to be executed on friday next.

whateuer becomes of him. I think your lop woud do well to gett Coll: poor and his gang secured¹⁰:—I'll answer with my head for wittnesses enough: I am your lops uery hum ble¹¹ ser^t to command

Tho: Southern

march y^e 8th: 1703/4¹².

¹ of note *inserted above*.

⁴ out *deleted*.

⁶ come *deleted*; return *inserted above*.

⁸ *Inserted above*.

¹⁰ *Inserted above*.

¹² This letter is endorsed, in Nottingham's hand:

Southern March d. v. 9: 1703/4.

² *Inserted above*.

⁵ *Inserted above*.

³ y^e *deleted*.

⁷ re present *divided between two lines*.

⁹ *Inserted above*.

¹¹ hum ble *divided between two lines*.

If, as Professor Sisson suggests to me, the 'd. v.' here signifies 'die veneris' (i.e., Friday), Nottingham made a curious mistake: March 9, 1703—4, was a Thursday.

Southerne served in the Duke of Berwick's regiment in the reign of James II, and had been notably favoured by him¹. one may therefore assume that the dramatist's slight acquaintance with Boucher dated from that period.

Boucher's experiences in England during the early part of 1704 may be briefly outlined. He apparently landed at Eastbourne with his wife and daughter early in December, 1703, and was arrested immediately on the information of a fisherman who recognised him as a man with a price on his head². On December 12, two officers were sent from London to arrest him and his daughter officially³, and two days later the same officers were sent to arrest his wife⁴. Evidence against him was then collected⁵, and on February 16, 1704, *The Daily Courant* announced that he would be arraigned on that day at East Grinstead. Two days later the same newspaper reported that the bill against him had been found by the Grand Jury of Sussex and that he would be tried on March 7. On February 19, the Attorney-General, Sir Edward Northey, sent to Nottingham a report of the proceedings at East Grinstead and suggested arrangements for trying Boucher in Westminster Hall⁶. Boucher wrote to Nottingham on February 25, protested his innocence, and announced his intention to plead guilty and to throw himself on the Queen's mercy⁷. He was tried on the 28th of the month, and was found guilty of high treason for being in arms in the service of King James in Ireland and for returning from France without a licence, and was sentenced to death⁸.

On March 7 Nottingham acknowledged Boucher's letter and suggested that he could save himself only by giving the valuable information which he doubtless possessed⁹. *The Daily Courant* for March 8 announced that Boucher would be executed on March 10, but on the 11th a note by Warre referred to an order for his release¹⁰. He was certainly not released at that time, for on April 18 Hedge sent a command to Sir Gilbert Heathcote that he should not execute Boucher 'whose case is under consideration'¹¹. There is, too, an undated petition from Boucher in the Public Record Office which was clearly written after this date¹². He declares in this that he has been reprieved but that he will in all likelihood perish through confinement if the royal bounty be not once more

¹ Cf. the preface to *The Spartan Dame* in the 1721 edition of Southerne's plays.

² *C.S.P. Dom.*, 1703-4, pp. 246, 287.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 479.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 538.

⁵ *The Post Man*, February 26-9, 1704; *The London Gazette*, February 28-March 2, 1704; *The Daily Courant*, February 29, 1704.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 568.

⁷ State Papers, Domestic, Anne, Bundle 36, No. 58.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 478.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 238, 515, 520, 521, 529.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 542.

¹¹ *C.S.P. Dom.*, 1703-4, p. 559.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 606.

extended to him. This must have been written in the summer of 1704, as he refers to his returning to England 'last winter.' There are no further references to him in the State Papers, and one can hopefully assume that his petition had the desired effect.

Boucher appears to have been unfortunate in his experiences and to have deserved Southerne's sympathy. There is, perhaps, a slight inconsistency between his statement to Nottingham that he had fruitlessly applied for a licence to return for the past two years and his statement in his petition that he was ignorant of the law against his return. What is, however, far more puzzling is Southerne's persistent indictment of the Irish officers. He not only suggests that they rather than Boucher should suffer but concludes his third letter with the advice that, whatever becomes of Boucher, they should be immediately secured. One cannot therefore assume that Southerne acted as he did through an outraged sense of justice; the informer, moreover, is rarely actuated by patriotic motives alone, and so one is forced to the conclusion that Southerne wished to do the government some slight service and to receive for it some substantial reward. He had flattered James in 1682 and he was a fierce anti-Jacobite in 1704; in each instance the purpose was the same, and the political change of face was merely a convenience which involved no sacrifice of principle.

There seems to be very little information concerning the six officers mentioned by Southerne. We learn from the first letter that Colonel Butler was the brother of Pierce Butler, Viscount Galmoy¹, who married Henrietta, the illegitimate daughter of James II, but it seems impossible to discover anything of his activities at this time. Southerne's letter to Nottingham on March 8 apparently made the Earl think seriously in the matter of Butler. He wrote to Southwell in Ireland on March 9² and stated that, according to information he had received, Colonel Butler was listing men privately in Ireland; he should be observed carefully, since he had recently come from France and appeared to have treasonable designs. Both Southwell and the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland replied from Dublin on March 16, declaring that they knew nothing of Butler³. There are, however, three references in the State Papers to a Colonel Walter Butler who was apparently applying for permission to return to Ireland from abroad. On November 27, 1703, Southwell sent Nottingham a number of Irish bills, including a private one marked 'Colonel Walter Butler⁴.' On December 24, Nottingham sent this with others to the

¹ Cf. *The Complete Peerage*, by G. E. C., New Edition, v, 1926, p. 610.

² *C.S.P. Dom.*, 1703-4, p. 566.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 572, 573.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 218.

Attorney-General: it is here described as 'a private bill for relief of Walter Butler¹.' On March 4, 1704, Southwell sent Nottingham a list of bills dropped by the Irish parliament during this session 'and notes thereon.' One of these is thus given:

Colonel Butler.—Having past a severe law against Popery, they had no mind to encourage anyone bred up in arms in foreign service to return².

Southerne had doubtless heard of Butler's return in defiance of this declaration.

'Colonel macCarty' may be identified with the Colonel Charles McCarty of Ballyea who is mentioned as being concerned in a rising in some information given by a prisoner in Newgate, dated June 27, 1703³. There was a Captain Jarvis Holland in Viscount Shannon's Regiment of Marines in 1702 and 1703⁴, but it seems unlikely that Southerne's 'Irish and Scotch' papists who had 'come over in swarms' would include a man holding a commission in the English army. There was no Major Maxwell in the English army in 1704, though the name Maxwell was borne by a number of officers⁵. I can discover nothing either of Colonel Poore or of Captain MacGrayth.

One would naturally expect that Southerne would meet the fate of most informers and would be satirised and lampooned by every Tory writer of the period. There are, however, only two instances known to me in which he is attacked for the violent change in his political views. One of these is contained in *The Tryal of Skill; or, A New Session of the Poets*, published in August, 1704⁶. This largely resembles other 'Sessions of Poets' in its form and in its subject-matter, but it has an especial bitterness of its own. There are seven stanzas dealing with Southerne:

CXXXXII

Tom S—— Petition'd the next, and besought
The Court that he must be preferr'd,
For he two Fat Places already had got,
And most grievously wanted a Third.

CXXXXIII

When the Judges amaz'd at his Temper and Suit,
Remanded him back to *White-hall*,
And declar'd, who had lost his Esteem and Repute,
Was not fit for their business at all.

¹ *C.S.P. Dom.*, 1703-4, p. 241.

² *Ibid.*, p. 558.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1702-3, p. 362; 1703-4, pp. 266, 270.

⁵ Cf. Charles Dalton, *English Army Lists*, 1661-1714, v.

⁶ Its publication was advertised in the issues of *The Daily Courant* for August 8 and 18. It is thus mentioned in Oldys's notes to Langbaine: 'Also a long character of him... and about his places and his disloyalty in a poem called the Tryall of Skill, or a New Session of Poets, fol. 1704, p. 20.' This verse-satire is exceedingly rare, and I have to thank Messrs P. J. and A. E. Dobell for kindly allowing me to examine a copy in their possession.

CXXXIV

Not but *Oroonoko*, some Merit might plead,
And take off from the weight of's Offence,
Were but every Character Just which we read,
And Consistent with Reason and Sence.

CXXXV

Were his Heroine but like his Heroe, not Fair,
Since their breath in one Country they drew,
And She that was born in an *Indian* Air,
Set forth in an *Indian* Hue.

CXXXVI

Yet for all that Mistake, it would be worth his while
And his Interest might not be lost,
For if this Contradiction he could reconcile,
He might stand assur'd of his Post.

CXXXVII

*How Treason and Loyalty could e'er agree,
And he could the World's Censure evade,
That meanly accepted an Agent to be,
Where P——ss Collonel was made?*

CXXXVIII

Such a Question as this drew the Blood into's Face,
And away from the Querists he ran,
Well knowing how near it came up to his Case,
That so lately had turn'd *Cat in Pan*.

It is clear that the writer of these verses has two objections to Southerne: he has acted as an informer against men with whom he once sympathised, and he has held two government 'places.' The sixth and seventh stanzas obviously refer to his letters to Nottingham, but I can offer no interpretation of the proper name 'P——ss.' I have also been unable to identify the 'two Fat Places' mentioned in the first stanza: neither the newspapers nor the State Papers of the period throw any light on the problem. There is, however, a letter printed by the Historical Manuscripts Commission which may be noted here¹. This was written by Francis Gwyn to Robert Harley from Bath on July 7, 1694, and contains the following sentence:

I hear this poet Southerne is giving up the secretaryship of the Admiralty, and that Bridgeman and Admiral Russell's Birket are to be joynt secretaries in his room.

There was only one 'poet Southerne' in this period, and this reference is naturally indexed as 'Southerne [Thomas] the poet.' Unfortunately, however, it was one James Southerne or Sotherne who was Secretary of the Admiralty during this period, who resigned in 1694, and who was

¹ Rep. xiv, App., Pt. II, p. 551.

succeeded by William Bridgeman and Josiah Burchett¹. This James Southerne was clerk to Robert Blackburn, Secretary to the Admiralty, in 1660, and later became clerk to Sir William Coventry². He was appointed joint Clerk of the Acts in 1667 and sole Clerk in 1679³, and held the Secretaryship of the Admiralty from 1689 to 1694⁴. Soon after his resignation he became a Commissioner of the Navy⁵. It is thus clear that Gwyn was in error in referring to 'this poet Southerne', and the possibility must be considered that the author of *The Tryal of Skill* had made a similar mistake⁶. Certainly James Southerne had held two exceptionally 'Fat Places,' and was in 1704 either dead or in retirement⁷.

The other attack upon Southerne is contained in *The Last Will and Testament of Mr Tho Brown, Arch-Poetae Celeberrimi*⁸:

Item. To S———*rn*, who for Gain
And Place of Trust, turn'd Cat in Pan.
And a good cause declining left,
Because of present Pence bereft,
I give my Inconstancy of Tomper,
To prove that he's not *Idem semper*,
But with each Point of Wind can vary,
And several Looks at several Seasons carry.

This, one may note, both accuses Southerne of place-hunting and appears to suggest that he was successful in his endeavours.

CLIFFORD LEECH.

LONDON.

Since this article went to press Dr W. R. Richardson has suggested to me that the abbreviation *P——ss* hides the identity of Sir Thomas Prendergast or Pendergrass, who turned king's evidence in a conspiracy of 1696. Dr Richardson will, I understand, discuss this identification at greater length in an article to be published shortly.

C. L.

¹ *A List of the Lords High Admiral and Commissioners for executing that Office, which have been from time to time appointed, since the year 1660* (Public Record Office), pp. 3–5.

² *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, edited by H. B. Wheatley, 1904, I, p. 31, n. 1.

³ *Samuel Pepys's Naval Minutes*, edited by J. R. Tanner, 1926, p. 258, n. 3.

⁴ *A List of the Lords High Admiral*, loc. cit.

⁵ His signature in this capacity appears on many documents; cf., e.g., *The Manuscripts of the House of Lords*, 1697–9, p. 265.

⁶ It may be noted, however, that as long before as 1693 Southerne had hinted his desire for a place in the dedication of *The Maid's Last Prayer* to the Honourable Charles Boyle. He excuses his dramatic work by saying that he has nothing else to do, and thus surely indicates his need of a pleasantly lucrative position.

⁷ In *Notes and Queries*, Series 3, XI (1867), p. 216, the question was asked whether James Southerne was in any way related to the dramatist. It seems impossible to arrive at a definite answer to this, but the relationship, if any, must have been very distant: all Thomas's known antecedents are Irish, and there could be only a slight connexion between his family and that of James.

⁸ This serves as an appendix to *A Letter from the Dead Tom Brown to the Living Heracutus*, published in July, 1704 (advertised in *The Daily Courant* on July 27 and 29). The passage quoted from *The Last Will* is on p. 30.

ON THE DATE OF 'A NEW WAY TO PAY OLD DEBTS'

MASSINGER's most lastingly popular play, *A new way to pay old Debts*, was first printed in 1633 'As it hath beene often acted at the Phænix in Drury-Lane, by the Queenes Maiesties seruants.' It had been entered in the Stationers' Register on November 10, 1632. It is generally believed to make play with the malfeasances of Sir Giles Mompesson and Sir Francis Mitchell, which were the subject of a Parliamentary enquiry in the first half of 1621. The date of its composition is a matter of inference or conjecture, within these limits, since Malone finds no record in the Office Book of Sir Henry Herbert of its licence for the stage; Boyle's conjectural date of 1625¹ has been very generally accepted, but the evidence for this date is not beyond question, and there are several considerations which tell in favour of Fleay's date of 1621².

The date 1625 practically rests on an allusion in i, ii, 24-8, where Furnace, the cook, complains that his mistress has lost her appetite, and will not do justice to his artistry,

Though I cracke my braines to find out tempting sawces,
And raise fortifications in the pastrie,
Such as might serue for modell in the Low-Countries,
Which if they had beene practis'd at *Breda*,
Spinola might haue throwne his cap at it, & ne're tooke it.

Breda fell to Spinola on July 1, 1625. The passage therefore furnishes reasonable grounds for inferring that the play was produced after that date, and this inference receives some support from two further considerations. (1) In 1625 the plague raged with unusual violence, and we have no record of Herbert's licensing any play for the stage between February 11, 1624/5 and January 22, 1625/6, so that the absence of any record of stage licence for a particular play believed to have been finished at this time need cause no great surprise. (2) The general course of Massinger's professional career appears to have been roughly this: from 1613 onward he wrote plays in collaboration with Fletcher and others for the King's Servants; between December 3, 1623 and November 3, 1624 he wrote three plays by himself for companies managed by Christopher

¹ *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1894, xxxvii, p. 13.

² *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, 1891, i, p. 214. Fleay dates the play before May, 1622, simply because of Herbert's apparent silence, and brushes aside the 1625 allusion as a subsequent insertion. He may have reasoned with himself on the lines followed in the present article, but he did not so reason with his readers.

Beeston¹; on October 11, 1626 he wrote *The Roman Actor* for the King's Servants, and thereafter wrote no play for any other company except *The great Duke of Florence* for the Queen's Servants in 1627. By assigning *A new way to pay old Debts* to the year 1625 we therefore fill what would otherwise be the unusually long gap of almost two years in the series of Massinger's productions², and at the same time fit in this Beeston play before Fletcher's death had brought Massinger back to his original company.

That is the case for 1625 as clearly as I can state it. Weaker reasons are perforce accepted for dating many Elizabethan plays, and I am not certain that the conclusion in this instance is wrong. I think, however, that it will be worth while to state the case for the earlier date.

Of the secondary considerations adduced in support of Boyle's dating, the first applies equally well to any date before May 7, 1622³, when the regular series of Herbert's records begins, and the second supports a date shortly before the period of Massinger's known association with Beeston's companies in 1624 almost as readily as a date shortly after it⁴. The earlier dating will leave the gap of nearly two years (November, 1624 to October, 1626) in the series of Massinger's extant independent productions, but his lost play *The Spanishe Viceroy* had been produced without licence in December, 1624—thereby getting the players into trouble with Sir Henry Herbert⁵—and part of his time must have been occupied with his contributions to the collaborated play *The faire Maide of the Inne*⁶. In any

¹ Beeston built the Phoenix (commonly called the Cockpit) in 1617, and managed there during the relevant period companies belonging to Queen Anne (1617-19), Prince Charles (1619-22), Lady Elizabeth (1622-5), and Queen Henrietta (1625-37) (E. Nungezer, *Dictionary of Actors*, p. 37). The three plays of Massinger referred to are *The Bondman* (December 3, 1623), *The Renegado* (April 17, 1624), and *The Parliament of Love* (November 3, 1624). The acting rights of the Cockpit plays were evidently vested in Beeston himself, not in his successive companies, so the statement on the title page of *A new way to pay old Debts* that (by 1633) it had often been acted by Queen Henrietta's company at the Cockpit does not mean that its first production there was by them.

² Dr R. S. Telfer has proposed to date *The Unnaturall Combat* (usually regarded as an early play of about 1621) at this time, but for reasons which I have given elsewhere (*R.E.S.*, October, 1933) I am on the whole slightly inclined to disagree with him.

³ The date on which Herbert licensed *The Changeling*, by Middleton and Rowley. See W. J. Lawrence, *The Times Literary Supplement*, November 29, 1923, p. 820. This note is not in J. Q. Adams, *Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*.

⁴ My own impression is that when, after years of uncongenial hackwork in collaborated plays for the King's Servants, Massinger secured the support of a wealthy patron and thereby the leisure to write plays in which he could take an artist's pride, the King's Servants took as many of his own plays as they could and the rest had to be sold to other companies. In 1625, on Fletcher's death, Massinger succeeded to the post of official poet to the King's Servants. This view is based on the available evidence, and I fancy that it is fairly widely held—at any rate in part. But this footnote is not the place to argue it, and it is too conjectural to be adduced as evidence.

⁵ J. Q. Adams, *Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 21, and below, p. 437, n. 3.

⁶ Licensed to the King's Servants, apparently as the work of Fletcher, on January 22, 1625/6, and printed in the 1647 Folio of Beaumont and Fletcher, but now ascribed to Massinger, Ford, and Webster. See Mr F. L. Lucas's introduction to his edition, in *The Complete Works of John Webster*, London, 1927, iv, pp. 148-52.

case, our ignorance of Massinger's life is too profound for us to regard a silence of two years as impossible. The argument for 1625 really rests on the allusion to the fall of Breda already quoted, and that is less conclusive than it looks at first glance. In this play Massinger's rhythms are looser and more Fletcherian than anywhere else in his work, but such Rowleian licence as the blank-verse line

Spmola might haue throwne his cap at it, & ne're tooke it

is unparalleled in Massinger's work—except where there has been alteration in the manuscript. A rhythmical analogy may be found in *Beleue as you List*, I, ii, 191 (Malone Soc. ed., line 548), where the line

tell vs his name when he seru'd you.—you all knewe him

is altered for greater clarity of expression to

tell vs yo^r chirurgions name when he seru'd you.—you all knewe him

Such an alteration may of course be made almost *currente calamo*, and is not, by itself, evidence of revision at a date much later than that of composition; but when the unmetrical line contains the only obvious dating reference in the play it becomes suspect as evidence, and we must look carefully for further indications of date.

The first and most obvious of these is the generally recognised fact that the villains of the piece, Sir Giles Overreach and Justice Greedy, are hits at the most prominent figures of a *cause célèbre* of 1621, Sir Giles Mompesson and Sir Francis Mitchell (who was, in fact, a Justice for the County of Middlesex). The play's most recent editor¹ is rather reluctant to recognise the topical allusion here, and objects that Mompesson and Overreach exercised their villainy in different fields; but he admits that 'the play may have owed some of its original success to the allusions which it makes to a public scandal of the day,' and the allusions are closer and more frequent than he was aware. So far from there being 'no reason for supposing that Sir Francis Mitchell was a Plautine figure like Greedy,' we find that one of Greedy's most marked peculiarities in the play—his lean, voracious appearance—belonged also to Sir Francis Mitchell, and was the subject of a pun by James I. Joseph Meade, writing from Cambridge on March 24, 1620/1, relates the royal witticism to Sir Martin Stuteville:

S^r Francis Michel (who being a very leane-fac't fellow & coming before his Ma^{tie}, his Ma^{tie} asked him what news from Bethlem Cabor telling him he was a Hungarian & could not but know &c.)².

¹ The late A. H. Cruickshank, Oxford, 1926. See his Introduction, pp. xi–xiv.

² MS. Harl. 389, fol. 41 v.

A new way to pay old Debts is in no sense a dramatisation of the intrigues and misdemeanours of Mompesson and Mitchell, but there can be no doubt that the allusions to their history were meant to be recognised, and, without exaggerating the shortness of the public's memory for notorious scandals, it is obvious that such allusions would be more sure of their effect in 1621, while Parliament's proceedings against Mompesson and Mitchell were still in progress or were freshly over, than in 1625, when more recent excitements had intervened.

Another topical allusion, more evanescent in its command of public recognition but unfortunately not to be dated so precisely, may be found in the dialogue between Welborne and Marrall in II, iii, 26-8:

<Mar.> Before th'assurance of her wealth¹ perfum'd you
You sauour'd not of amber.

Welb. I doe now then?

Kisses the end of his cudgell.

Mar. This your Battoone hath got a touch of it.

It would appear—although the *New English Dictionary* gives no hint of the fact—that the word 'battoon' was at one time used in a specialised sense as the name of a particular kind of cudgel or cane which enjoyed a passing fashionable esteem. In a mock prophecy in *The Welsh Ambassador* (an anonymous play preserved in manuscript and dated about 1623 on the strength of the following passage) we read:

Clo: but now in the yeares 1621: 22 & 23 such a wooden fashion will come vpp
that hee whoe walkes not wth a *Battoone* shalbee held noe gallant

Wm: Battoone whats that

Clo: a kind of Cudgell noe longer then that wth a water spaniell carries crosse his
chopps yo^u haue seene shapperoones & marqueroones and baboones, & laroones,
& petoones, & gog^e noones, but this Lyninge of plimoth cloake (calld the battoone)
is a stuff but new cutt out of the loome².

This fixes the time when the fashion arose, and the flattering use of a fashionable term for the rough stick that Welborne bore is highly appropriate to the context of our passage. The authenticated dates for the vogue are 1621-3³. Massinger's reference may have been made later, but the nearer it was to the beginning of the fashion the more effective it would have been.

There are these two passages in the play each of which might have rather more point in 1621 than in 1625. Some features of its poetic and dramatic style also seem to indicate the earlier date.

¹ *Sc.* the wealth of Lady Allworth, whom Marrall has been led to think Welborne will marry.

² *The Welsh Ambassador*, v, iii, 2161-9 (Malone Soc. ed.).

³ It would be wrong to stress the final date unduly, for there is an apparently similar use of "battoon" in *The Elder Brother*, v, 1, 37, and no one but Mr Oliphant dates that play earlier than 1625. (He dates its original version about 1614 because 'the Fletcher portions of the play seem to me to be written in a comparatively early style.' In any case the relevant passage is one of those ascribed to Massinger.)

In his edition of *The Duke of Millaune* (Lancaster, Pa., 1918, p. 2) Professor T. W. Baldwin printed a Metrical Table of Definitely Dated Plays, in Part or in Whole by Massinger. Since *A new way to pay old Debts* is not a Definitely Dated Play it did not appear in Baldwin's list; and since a metrical table is essentially a statistical analysis of its compiler's personal impressions my figures are not directly comparable with Baldwin's. He did, however, formulate one metrical test which may be applied to the present play. He found that whilst the percentages of double endings and of weak endings in the chronological series of Massinger's plays fluctuate, the percentages of run-on lines and of light endings increase regularly from *The Bondman* (1623) to *Beleeue as you Lust* (1631), the run-on lines by rather more than 2 per cent. each year¹. My own figures for all plays or parts of plays do not support this theory of a *regular* increase, but they do show a *general tendency* to increase up to 1631. It may therefore be of some significance that *A new way to pay old Debts* has a lower percentage of run-on lines (46) than any other of Massinger's independent plays, the nearest are *The Duke of Millaune* (of uncertain date, but assigned by Baldwin to 1621 or 1622) and *The Parhament of Loue* (of 1624), with 53 per cent. each. To discover elsewhere in Massinger's work so low a percentage of run-on lines as we find in the present play we must turn to the parts ascribed to him by modern scholars in a group of four plays written in collaboration with Fletcher and dated 1619-22 (on the evidence of the lists of actors prefixed to them in the 1679 Folio of Beaumont and Fletcher). These plays, the parts of them ascribed to Massinger², and the percentages of run-on lines in those parts, are as follows:

The Custome of the Countrey, II, i-iv; III, iv, v; IV, i, ii; V, i-iv, v, 195-end. 41 per cent.

The False One, I; V. 55 per cent.

The Little French Lawyer, I; III, i, iii; IV, v, vi, 1-88, vii; V, i, 163-end, iii. 44 per cent.

The Double Marriage, I; III, 1; IV, i, 17-end, ii; V, ii, 1-37, iii, iv. 39 per cent.

The percentages of run-on lines vary with the tone and subject-matter of the plays as well as with the period of their composition, but on the

¹ I neglect weak endings and light endings, of which the numbers are too small to have any statistical value.

² The ascriptions are my own, but only in the case of *The Double Marriage* are there differences of opinion sufficient to have much effect on the percentages for the whole of his contributions to each play.

whole they associate *A new way to pay old Debts* with the earlier part of Massinger's work.

The percentages of double endings are of interest in a different way. Baldwin has formulated no ascending or descending curve of them, but they are more frequent here (55 per cent.) than in any other independent play of Massinger's (the nearest approach being another comedy, *The City-Madam*, of 1632, with 52 per cent.). The characteristic rhythm arising from this relative frequency of double endings in *A new way to pay old Debts* is only one of several ways in which its style resembles that of Fletcher's comedies. The influence of the elder dramatist makes itself felt in characterisation and in atmosphere as well as in versification. Lady Allworth's servants in the present play are drawn with boisterous good-humour, revealing a sympathy with simple animal spirits such as Massinger does not show in other plays. In *The Picture*, in *The great Duke of Florence*, in *The Guardian*, and generally throughout his plays, Massinger laughs at the crudity of his servants: here alone does he join, as Fletcher did, in their spirit of rough fun. Again, Massinger's hero, Welborne, is here, and here alone, a thoroughly Fletcherian young man, who has wasted his patrimony on women, wine, and clothes, and proceeds to recover it by a trick of which we admire the independent and resourceful spirit rather than the morality. He is very different in conception from any other character in Massinger's plays. Fletcher's influence in such respects as these is rather more likely to be felt in an early play than in one written when Massinger's own style was more mature and settled.

There remains one further way in which *A new way to pay old Debts* is linked in spirit with Massinger's earlier years. He was a serious-minded writer, and many of his plays contain explicit or very thinly-veiled criticism of English social and industrial life and of the government's domestic and foreign policy¹. The subjects and the nature of his criticism changed with the external state of affairs and with his own mental growth. Some of his later plays—*Beleeue as you List* and *The Emperour of the East*, both of 1631, and (so far as one can judge from Herbert's seven-line quotation², which is all that remains of it) *The King and the*

¹ First noted in S. R. Gardiner's article on *The Political Element in Massinger in Contemporary Review*, August, 1876, xxviii, p. 495 f.

² Monys? Wee'le rayse supplies what ways we please,
And force you to subscribe to blanks, in which
We'le mulct you as wee shall thinke fitt. The Cæsars
In Rome were wise, acknowledginge no lawes
But what their swords did ratifiye, the wives
And daughters of the senators bowinge to
Their wills, as derties, etc. (Malone, *Variorum Shakspeare*, 1821, iii, 240.)

Subject of 1638—are directed against the foreign or domestic policy of Charles I, but not against the King in person nor against any individual ministers. The earlier plays are much more personal in their criticism. *The Bondman* (1623) attacks Buckingham as Lord Admiral under the name of Gisco; *The Maid of Honour* (date uncertain, but assigned by its latest editor¹ to between 1619 and 1623) assails him as the King's favourite under the name of Fulgentio; *The Duke of Millaine* (dated by Baldwin 1621 or 1622) has in one scene (III, ii, 1-58) what appear to be open references to three recent social scandals (though only one of them has yet been explained, and that rather doubtfully²). It is to this period that *A new way to pay old Debts*, with its open allusions to Mompesson and Mitchell, seems to belong. What we know or surmise of Massinger's career suggests a course of development which may be crudely stated thus: in the three early plays just mentioned Massinger pilloried individual persons; in 1624 the King's Servants got into trouble with the censorship for producing his (lost) play *The Spanishe Viceroy* without a licence³; in 1626 he produced what was so far as we know his next independent play, *The Roman Actor*, which contains his famous defence of the stage in the speech of Paris before the Roman Senate⁴ but which abstains from attacks on individuals; henceforth Massinger may attack abuses and policies but he does not attack persons. Our knowledge is so incomplete that this blunt summary probably over-emphasises and possibly distorts the evidential value of the recorded facts; but we have no other grounds for inference, and it is tempting to conjecture from these that Massinger learned his lesson from the trouble over *The Spanishe Viceroy* in 1624 and abstained, thereafter, from personal criticism and innuendo. If we could feel sure that this reconstruction of Massinger's

¹ Miss E. A. W. Bryne, London, 1927, see her Introduction, pp. xxxiii-xxxv.

² Baldwin and others have accepted Fleay's conjecture that the 'fellow | That could indite forsooth, and make fine meeters' of III, ii, 17-24 is George Wither, and that the reference is to his trouble with the authorities over *Withers Motto* of 1621.

³ We may make a pretty shrewd guess at what the trouble with *The Spanishe Viceroy* was, if the title means anything. In August, 1624, Middleton's *A Game at Chesse* was suppressed, although it had been duly licensed by Herbert in June, because Gondomar, the Spanish Ambassador, complained to King James of its personal attacks on him. Herbert was most unlikely to license another play attacking Gondomar and the King's Spanish policy in December!

⁴ *The Roman Actor*, I, iii, 31-142. The whole passage, too long to be quoted, is a rather casuistical defence of actors against the charge of having intended such personal allusions in their plays as the audience may recognise, on the grounds that they portray types and the application is not their affair. Its insincerity is obvious from the fact that in the course of it Paris suggests that their 'typical' portrait of an unjust judge might well be applied to Rusticus, who is trying him, and that immediately on his release he selects from his repertory a play likely to bring home the error of his ways to the miser Philargus. In fact it portrays Paris as doing very much what Massinger had done in the past, but so far as we can recognise the author himself does not so allude to any real people in this play or in later ones.

development were true, we should be forced to assign *A new way to pay old Debts* to a date earlier than December, 1624; and once the latter half of 1625 is ruled out all the evidence points to 1621. As it is, the reconstruction is only a bit of flimsy guess-work, but whatever degree of probability it has belongs also to the earlier dating of this play.

The evidence is uncomfortably inconclusive, but my argument may be summarised thus. the absence from Herbert's Office Book, when Malone saw it, of any record of the licensing of *A new way to pay old Debts* suggests that the play was written either (*a*) before Herbert's entries began in May, 1622, or perhaps (*b*) in the year of confusion 1625. The allusions to contemporary events and fashions point to 1621, and all the play's literary qualities suggest an early date. The only reason whatever for preferring the later date is an explicit and brief reference to an event of 1625, and this is contained in a line whose metrical irregularity is sufficient in itself to suggest that it is an alteration of the original draft. The evidential value of the reference is thereby destroyed, and we are thrown back on the reasons, cumulative though less precise, for dating the play 1621.

A. K. McILWRAITH.

LIVERPOOL.

DR JOHNSON AND THE 'LIFE OF GOLDSMITH'

IN 1802 appeared a four-volume edition of the works of Oliver Goldsmith, prefaced by a lengthy memoir¹. The original impetus towards this memoir had taken place as early as April 28, 1773, when Goldsmith dictated various particulars of his life to Thomas Percy 'one rainy day at Northumberland House²,' but the life as it finally appeared in 1802 was only partly the work of Percy. During the intervening years there had been repeated negotiations and several differing plans for the edition. I do not propose to go into the whole of this long history, but to consider only the part played by Dr Johnson. At one time Dr Johnson was the person who was expected to write the life and to whom the materials for it were sent; but Johnson never wrote it. It is not clear why this intended biography never materialised; reasons have been given, but they do not seem to coincide with truth, and the latest account does not remove any of the confusion³.

On pp. 22-3 of her book Miss Balderston writes:

It is well known how Johnson's attempt to write the Life, and edit the works, of his friend was balked. Carnan, the partner of Francis Newbery, and owner of the copyright of *She Stoops to Conquer*, invoked the newly-passed copyright law to refuse permission for the reprinting of that play. It is not clear whether he opposed the separate edition which Johnson at first planned, or whether he opposed its inclusion among the *Works of the English Poets* projected by the forty eminent booksellers in March, 1777, for which Johnson was engaged to write the biographical prefaces—the modest beginning of the *Lives of the Poets*. The effect, however, was the same. The copyright law protected Carnan until 1787, fourteen years after the first publication of the play, and as the Life could not, according to their eighteenth-century point of view, avail much without the works, there was nothing to do but wait. Johnson died before the time had expired. There is no reason to suppose, however, that had he lived he would not have resumed the task at the expiration of the copyright. Malone, who seems to have known more about Johnson's plans for the Life than anyone else, wrote to Percy on March 2, 1785, . . . 'Dr Johnson used to say that he never could get an accurate account of Goldsmith's history while he was abroad,' which seems to indicate a continued effort on Johnson's part to collect information on the subject. It is not necessary to point out that Percy was misinformed, in accusing Johnson, in his reply to Malone, of utterly forgetting both Goldsmith's family and the Memoir.

Let us first consider the question of Johnson's intention to publish the life as a preface to a volume of the booksellers' edition. It is not obvious how the copyright mentioned by Miss Balderston would prevent Gold-

¹ The edition is dated 1801, but did not appear till 1802.

² Percy to Malone, June 16, 1785; quoted in Prior, *Goldsmith*, I, p. x.

³ Miss K. C. Balderston's *History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith*, Cambridge, 1926.

smith finding a place in this edition of the *English Poets*¹. *She Stoops to Conquer* is not a poem², but a play, and is written in prose; and in *The Works of the English Poets* plays were not included even when they were in verse. Dryden's plays, for example, are not printed in this edition. And when Goldsmith *was* included in the collection—see the second edition, 1790, volume the seventieth—it was only the poems that were printed.

But Carnan owned a more pertinent copyright. John Newbery had published *The Traveller* in 1764, and Carnan inherited this copyright. This was much more important, for an edition of Goldsmith's poems that did not include *The Traveller* could not be thought of. Carnan, then, might be an obstacle to the booksellers if he chose to be. But he could not be so for long; the copyright of *The Traveller* expired in 1778, and this gave the booksellers ample time to include Goldsmith in their edition if they wished, for the *English Poets* did not appear till 1779–81. Goldsmith's poems were very saleable material, and it seems likely that the booksellers would want to publish them in their edition, particularly if such an action would have been any gesture against Carnan.

Carnan at this time was still involved in a quarrel with the Stationers' Company. He had invaded their monopoly of printing almanacks, and a judgment in the Court of Common Pleas, May 29, 1775, had decided the question in his favour. The Company then induced Lord North to bring in a bill reinvesting them with the monopoly, but Erskine caused this to be rejected, May 10, 1779. At the time when the edition of the poets was being planned, the matter was still in dispute, and it is unlikely that the booksellers would have been slow to see when Carnan's copyright expired or to have taken legitimate advantage of it, if they had desired. Such an action was easier for them after the decision given to the Lords on February 22, 1774, following an appeal from a verdict given in Chancery in the case of *Donaldson v. Beckett*. Miss Balderston must be referring to this when she speaks of 'the newly-passed copyright law'; the only copyright law up to that time having been passed during Anne's reign. The effect of the judges' decision would be the opposite to that Miss Balderston states: for the booksellers and not Carnan would be the

¹ Prior was the first to state that the copyright of *She Stoops* prevented Johnson's edition, but he did not suggest this was a volume of the *English Poets*. Birkbeck Hill made the mistake of giving Prior's statement this meaning; note to *Johnson*, III, p. 100. Hill is the first to say that *She Stoops* stopped Goldsmith's inclusion in *The Works of the Poets*.

² It is interesting to note that Malone always classes the plays among Goldsmith's poems; and in the 1801 edition they are printed as 'Dramatic Poems' (see Contents of vol. II).

party to invoke it. The judges decided in 1774 that copyright was not a common-law right, but a statute right, and that after the term of years stated in the 1709 Act had elapsed copyright in a work no longer existed. Before this decision copyright had been considered and treated as a perpetual right; one owned the rights of printing a book just as one owned a house; and all that the Act of 1709 was considered to do was to strengthen that common-law perpetual copyright by statutory penalties for a certain period. Before the 1774 decision, then, Carnan would have been considered as the owner of the copyright after the fourteen years had elapsed, and the booksellers would have been on very insecure ground if they had published a poem without the owner's consent after the statutory period. But after 1774 they could publish with impunity once the statutory period had elapsed; and in the case of *The Traveller* this took place in 1778.

Why then did not Goldsmith appear in the first edition of the *English Poets*, and why did not Dr Johnson write a critical and biographical preface for it? Malone states twice that only a question of copyright stopped the inclusion of Goldsmith; in a letter to Percy, March 2, 1785¹, he says: 'I often pressed Dr Johnson to write his life, and he would have done so, had not the booksellers from the clashing of interests in the property of his works excluded them from their great collection of English Poetry.' In a note to Boswell's *Johnson*² he mentions Carnan: 'the poems of Goldsmith (whose life I know he intended to write, for I collected some materials for it by his desire) were omitted in consequence of a petty exclusive interest in some of them, vested in Mr Carnan, a bookseller.' But Carnan could not have been responsible for stopping the edition after 1778, and Carnan was not the only bookseller possessing valuable copyright matter in Goldsmith's poems. *The Deserted Village*, the next important poem after *The Traveller*, had been published in 1770 by W. Griffin of Catherine Street, Strand, and the copyright in that did not expire until 1784. Griffin's name is not among the publishers of the *Works of the Poets*. It is interesting to try to see what was happening. Carnan's copyright in *The Traveller* was expiring, and the booksellers were his enemies. Griffin's copyright was essential to an edition of the poems, and there is no evidence that he gave his permission. It is possible that Griffin was the person to refuse his copyright. Carnan and he were on fairly good terms. In 1775 and 1778 Griffin published Goldsmith's poems; both editions contained *The Traveller*. Carnan was at this time

¹ Add. MS. 42516, f. 102 v.

² Croker's edition, 1856, p. 533.

fighting the Stationers' Company, and we may assume that he would not lightly have allowed anyone to publish his copyright matter. Malone¹ called him 'a most impracticable man and at variance with all his bretheren,' but it must not be overlooked that each of Malone's London editions of Goldsmith, printed in 1780 and 1786, contained *She Stoops* (Carnan's copyright), and that Carnan was associated with six others as the publisher. Griffin is not mentioned on the title pages, but his copyright poem and play were included². Carnan and Griffin seem to have had a good understanding in all this; each allowed the other to print his copyright material, and it must not be forgotten that their two poems were easily the two most important poems of Goldsmith. Carnan was not averse to collaborating with a few other publishers at this time, but he probably felt differently towards the numerous booksellers who published the *English Poets*, and who practically composed the Stationers' Company. He would probably welcome any opportunity of thwarting them. It is perhaps not too fanciful to find an explanation of the non-publication of Goldsmith's poems in Griffin's refusal to allow *The Deserted Village* to be included, and this due to Carnan's suggestion.

The collaborations mentioned above in publishing Goldsmith's *Works* have a significance when one turns to consider the alternative proposal—a separate edition intended for the relief of Goldsmith's relatives. Percy definitely implies that this was what Johnson intended; in a letter to Malone, June 16, 1785³, he writes: 'The other memoranda on the subject were transmitted to me by his brother and others of his family, to afford materials for a life of Goldsmith which Johnson was to write and publish for their benefit.' This edition would probably have contained the plays as well as the poems, since the poems alone would have made rather a slim volume. If the plays were intended to be included, Carnan's copyright in *She Stoops* at once became important. But the edition would have been no longer a booksellers' edition; it would not have been more or less a production of the Stationers' Company: in which case Carnan would not have such strong reasons for being 'impracticable and at variance.' We have seen that Carnan co-operated with other booksellers in producing Malone's editions of 1780 and 1786; the first of these came out while the *English Poets* was being published, and one can see no reason why this edition should not have contained Johnson's life of Goldsmith had it been written. An edition of the poems and plays with

¹ MS. Malone 26, f. 8 v.

² Griffin also owned the copyright of *The Good-Natur'd Man*, published in 1768.

³ Prior, *Goldsmith*, I, p. xi.

such a preface should not have been impossible to produce; Carnan and Griffin owned the four important copyrights, and were accustomed to collaboration. Perhaps, however, financial terms for a benefit edition would have been difficult to arrange with Carnan.

But Johnson, if he had met with copyright or financial difficulties, could have published a separate life without an edition. There was no eighteenth-century view that made this impracticable, in spite of Miss Balderston's statement: Johnson when comparatively unknown had published a *Life of Savage* without any *Works*, and what Johnson could do in 1744 he could do in 1777; in 1774 Glover had published a small separate *Life of Goldsmith*, and what Glover could do Johnson could. If this is what Johnson contemplated—a life without the works—there is only one person to blame for its non-appearance, and Percy was perfectly correct when he wrote to Malone in 1785¹ that Johnson 'utterly forgot them and the subject,' i.e., the relatives and the life.

Perhaps something like this happened. Johnson began to take an interest in and receive materials for Goldsmith's biography in 1776; in May, 1777, he agreed to write the prefaces for the booksellers, and may have thought of including Goldsmith in this collection (though as a benefit edition special arrangements would have to be made); then finding that at that time there was a copyright difficulty he deferred the life. Malone twice stated that Goldsmith would have been in the *English Poets* but for copyright trouble. If, as I suggest, it was Griffin's copyright that held them up, and not Carnan's, the booksellers could not have published Goldsmith till 1784 instead of being able to do so by 1778; and by 1784 Johnson had given up the idea. But questions of copyright did not mean that Johnson could not have written the life; Johnson's forgetfulness and laziness (he was getting old and the prefaces were not an easy task) had doubtless much to do with the result; he apparently did not put pen to paper in spite of Malone's frequent reminders, and in spite of having all the collected materials for the biography in his possession. It is a pity he did not write the life; apart from any other value it would have had, it would have prevented the complicated negotiation and ill-feeling that preceded the edition of 1801.

ARTHUR TILLOTSON.

OXFORD.

¹ Prior, *ibid.*, I, p. xi.

MOLIÈRE AND LA MOTHE LE VAYER

IV. MOLIÈRE AND SCEPTICISM¹.

THERE was, as we have seen, a close community of thought between Molière and Le Vayer on such widely divergent matters as pedantry, obduracy in opinion, the abuses of the age, the futility of protesting against them, the iniquities of the doctors and the healing beneficence of nature. Can we go further, and say that Molière shared the general moral outlook of his friend? and that the greatest of French writers was at heart a sceptic?

The problem of Molière's 'philosophy' is the harder to solve, since it is one in which all the critics are at variance. Only a thorough enquiry into the dramatist's ideas in the light of the ideas of his age is likely to help us; nor can the answer be more than provisional, since the history of seventeenth-century thought, and particularly free-thought, has still to be written².

Whatever his innermost beliefs, Molière was assuredly not a Christian thinker. Like Gassendi, who was a priest, and La Mothe Le Vayer, who had been a protégé of the great Cardinal's, he accepted the forms of Catholicism, but without conviction or enthusiasm and rather as a matter of good breeding. Just as he towered above all other French writers of the old régime, except Descartes, so his vision ranged beyond the theological controversies of his day. He was not an unbeliever³; his views were probably those of a deist. But he did not concern himself with the problem of human destiny. His main interest was in practical morals, and more especially social morals. Instead of speaking of Molière's 'philosophy,' it would be more accurate to say, Molière's 'ethics.'

In considering the formation of these views, we must remember that, with the exception of the Cartesian Boileau, the majority of his personal friends belonged to the 'Libertin' group⁴. The men with whom he con-sorted by choice, and with whose views he may be presumed to have been in general sympathy, were free-thinkers: such men as Chapelle, Bernier and La Mothe Le Vayer and his circle. The authors whom he read were probably those in his own library. An inventory of this was made after

¹ Continued from *Modern Language Review*, XXVIII, p. 367.

² Prof. O. H. Prior has indicated the lines on which this work will be done. See *Morceaux choisis des Penseurs français*, Paris, 1930, Introduction, pp. 13-20.

³ See the speech of Cléante in *Tartuffe*, Act I, sc. vi. There is a personal accent here.

⁴ See the excellent book of Perrens, *Les Libertins en France au 17^e Siècle*, Paris, 1896.

his death; it was discovered and reprinted by Soulié. From this record we learn that the library contained, among other works, the Bible, Plutarch, a large number of classical authors, mainly Latin, nine books of travel, some historical works, Corneille's works, two hundred and forty volumes of comedies, French, Italian and Spanish, Montaigne's *Essais*, and La Mothe Le Vayer's works, 2 volumes in-folio¹. There is no mention of Gassendi. It was not then in the main from the Christian philosophers, but from the ancient sages and the humanists who had continued their work in modern times that Molière drew his ideas.

Until a few years ago almost every critic, friendly or hostile, believed that the dramatist had been a personal pupil of Gassendi, the Epicurean philosopher and mathematician who, according to Grimarest, 'ayant remarqué dans Molière toute la docilité et toute la pénétration nécessaires pour prendre les connaissances de la philosophie, se fit un plaisir de la lui enseigner en même temps qu'à Messieurs Chapelle et Bernier.' A legend of the most tenacious character had grown up, and for a century or more it seems to have been impossible to think of Molière without seeing him seated at the feet of Gassendi. But M. Michaut has now shown that the whole story was a fabrication of Grimarest's². Not only was Gassendi not in Paris at the time when the young Poquelin might be presumed to have shared these lessons with Lhuillier's son, Chapelle, that is, in 1639 or 1640—Gassendi arrived in 1641³—but we have only to open Tallemant des Réaux⁴ to discover that these famous lessons, over which so much ink has been spilled, were given many years later, in 1650; that they were given not in Paris, but in Provence; and that Chapelle and Bernier were alone in receiving them, Molière being at this time fully occupied with his company⁵.

If Molière was never a personal pupil of Gassendi's, it does not of course follow that he did not owe to that philosopher his general outlook on life and morals. Gassendi's ideas enjoyed a wide vogue, and he himself had been an honoured guest in the house of La Mothe Le Vayer. We must admit, however, that the evidence for Gassendi's influence on Molière is not at all conclusive; M. Michaut at least rejects most of it.

We do know, on the testimony of good witnesses, that Molière translated into French verse a considerable portion of Lucretius' poem, the

¹ E. Soulié, *Recherches sur Molière et sur sa famille*, Paris, 1863, pp. 92–3. See also the Appendix, XLV, pp. 262 *et seq.*, particularly p. 269.

² *La Jeunesse de Molière*, 1923, pp. 60–72, 82–93.

³ Michaut, p. 72.

⁴ *Historiettes*, IV, pp. 194–5, quoted by Michaut, p. 89.

⁵ Michaut, pp. 89, 90 and 91. See also the recent article by M. Michaut, *La Biographie de Molière* in *Annales de l'Université de Paris*, mars-avril, 1932, p. 139.

De Rerum Natura. The passage on the charming prejudice of lovers, which occurs in the *Misanthrope*:

L'amour pour l'ordinaire est peu fait à ces lois,
Et l'on voit les amants vanter toujours leur choix¹,

is presumably a fragment of the above work, and we may infer from this that Molière was attracted by the Epicurean attitude. But we can hardly infer that he was a keen disciple of Gassendi. Those who believe Molière to have been an Epicurean will quote Clitandre in his speech to Armande:

Pour moi par un malheur je m'aperçois, Madame,
Que j'ai, ne vous déplaise, un corps tout comme une âme².

But it is probably not a question in this speech of Epicurean or any other philosophy. It is a practical question, and Clitandre is expressing the views of an ordinary man. Finally, it may be argued that Molière is decidedly at one with Gassendi in his opposition to Descartes. Let us examine Molière's attitude. For him we are indeed made up of flesh and spirit. To deny the claims of either is to invite unhappiness. While admitting³, like Gassendi⁴ and Bernier⁵, the primacy of spirit, he does not exalt the soul at the expense of the body. Can we infer from this that Molière had no sympathy with the Cartesian standpoint? The conclusion is inviting, but the evidence is entirely against it. Grimarest himself, without seeing the inconsistency of the statement with his previous one concerning the lessons with Gassendi, reports Molière as saying in the presence of the lay-brother at Auteuil:

J'en fais juge le bon père, si le système de Descartes n'est pas cent fois mieux imaginé que tout ce que M. de Gassendi nous a ajusté au théâtre pour nous faire passer les rêveries d'Epicure. Passe pour la morale; mais le reste ne vaut pas la peine que l'on y fasse attention.

We have then only two serious pieces of evidence in favour of Molière's supposed Epicureanism: the translation of Lucretius, and the phrase 'Passe pour la morale.' The former proves very little, and the latter shows at most a very tepid enthusiasm for the ethics of Gassendi and Epicureanism.

Molière was not a materialist; but he was far from despising the little span of human life: we are here, he believed, to live happily and to give happiness to others. But Molière certainly agreed with Gassendi and the Epicureans in preferring the pleasures of the mind to those of the body. To cultivate art and letters, to lead a moral life and to practise modera-

¹ Act II, sc. v.

² *Femmes Savantes*, Act IV, sc. ii.

⁴ Letter to Descartes, *Œuvres*, III, pp. 874-5.

⁵ Letter to Chapelle, *Voyages*, II, pp. 109 *et seq.*

³ *Ibid.*

tion, was better, in his mind, and in theirs, than indulgence in the pleasures that appeal to the multitude; it was preferable because it was conducive to more and higher pleasure. Whether or not there is an ultimate sanction for virtuous conduct, such conduct is always desirable because it promotes tranquillity of spirit¹.

These ideas, however, were not peculiar to the Epicureans. They formed part of the lay-morals of the age, and many of the sceptics, and even of the Stoics, would have subscribed to them. If Molière shared them with the free-thinkers, we cannot say exactly that he owed them to any one writer. Bernier, who inspired great respect in his friends, might have influenced him at least as much as Gassendi. Now one of Bernier's great merits was the freedom and suppleness of his mind. A disciple of Gassendi, he gradually discarded the pure Epicureanism which Chapelle had embraced; and in the famous letter written to Chapelle from Persia in June, 1668, he shows distinct spiritualist leanings:

Nous devons prendre [he concludes] une plus haute idée de nous-mêmes et ne pas faire notre âme de si basse étoffe que ces grands philosophes [Democritus and Epicurus], trop corporels en ce point . . . si nous ne pouvons pas bien savoir au vrai ce que nous sommes, du moins savons-nous très bien ce que nous ne sommes pas: que nous ne sommes pas ainsi entièrement de la boue et de la fange, comme ils le prétendent².

With all this Gassendi would have agreed. But Bernier did not stop here; and what is most significant in the light of our argument, we find him in later years adopting a sceptical attitude: 'M. Bernier, ce grand partisan d'Épicure, avoue aujourd'hui qu'après avoir philosophé cinquante ans, il doute des choses qu'il avait cru les plus assurées³.' So writes Saint-Évremond, and it is evident, from what he goes on to say, that he too had diluted the Epicureanism of his youth with considerable doses of Pyrrhonism.

Here, then, are two of the principal Epicureans of the seventeenth century both moving in the direction of scepticism. The fact is significant, and it may guide us in the study of Molière's ideas.

What the moral philosophy of the better type of Epicurean was we may gather from other pages in Saint-Évremond. The tact and urbanity of the man of the world are allied, in this original mind, with the wisdom of the humanist. Moderation is the watchword of his ethics. Saint-Évremond, like La Mothe Le Vayer, had seen the vanity of attempts to reform the world around him; he had deprecated 'une vertu trop sévère,'

¹ See Prior, *Morceaux choisis des Penseurs français*, Introduction, p. 16.

² *Voyages*, II, pp. 109 et seq.

³ *Sur la morale d'Épicure. Les Véritables Œuvres de Monsieur de Saint-Évremond*, London, 1706, IV, pp. 296 et seq. Quoted by Prior, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

so much so that a recent critic has seen in his writings, or at least in the influence of his thought, a possible source of *Le Misanthrope*¹.

We have mentioned the leading Epicureans of the age because it is possible that Molière owed something to them. But, if he shared many of their ideas, it does not necessarily follow that he owed these ideas to their influence. It is far more likely that he drew his moral philosophy from some older source, and that it is of 'sceptical' rather than Epicurean origin.

Now it was Pierre Charron who had done more than any other writer to elaborate the 'lay-morals' of the seventeenth century; and it would not be hard to show that Molière's leading ideas are already present in the treatise *De la Sagesse*². The sage, according to Charron, cultivates 'la prud'hommie,' that is, virtuous conduct, without regard to any sanction but that of 'natural obligation'³. It is possible, therefore, to be virtuous without hope of reward, and, in fact, without supernatural aid: Charron here admits a theory which La Mothe Le Vayer was to develop in great detail in *De la Vertu des Païens*. The real sanction of 'prud'hommie' is Nature; and the way of Nature is the way of God. In this sense Charron believes that we should follow Nature. We cannot exactly say that this is a non-religious ethic⁴; but it is the first and essential step in the direction of an ethic resting on purely human sanctions. This, it will be seen, is precisely Molière's standpoint, and also, if we are not mistaken, that of La Mothe Le Vayer. We should live 'according to nature,' that is, within the limits prescribed by reason and experience. There is no question of blind obedience to instinct, but neither must we cheat or thwart Nature. To resist Nature 'c'est prétendre ramer contre le cours de l'eau.'

¹ G. Ascoli, *Le Misanthrope de Molière et la sagesse libertine. Revue universitaire*, oct. 1925, pp. 229-34.

² Prof. H. Ashton, the most judicious of recent writers on Molière, says: 'If sources must be indicated... then it should be remarked that his [i.e., Molière's] friend La Mothe Le Vayer carried forward the philosophy of Charron who was in turn imbued with the teaching of Montaigne. Molière possessed the works of La Mothe Le Vayer and Montaigne's *Essays*. Since Charron's work, *De la Sagesse*, was read by most of Molière's contemporaries (there were at least thirty-nine editions issued during his lifetime), and fully discussed by his friends, it is inadmissible that he did not read it and take part in these discussions' (*Molière, 'The Republic of Letters,' Routledge, 1930, pp. 204-5*). We believe that Prof. Ashton is right, though we would add that La Mothe Le Vayer, while in some ways continuing Charron, is an independent thinker who goes back to the Ancients (see Prior, *op. cit.*, p. 87), and also elaborates ideas of his own.

³ 'Nature nous est ensemble et maîtresse qui nous enjoint et commande la prud'hommie, et loi ou instruction qui nous l'enseigne. Quant au premier, il y a une obligation naturelle, interne et universelle à tout homme d'être homme de bien, droit entier suivant l'intention de son auteur et facteur. L'homme ne doit point attendre ni chercher autre cause, obligation, ressort, ou motif de sa prud'hommie, et n'en saurait jamais avoir un plus juste et légitime, plus puissant, plus ancien, il est tout aussi tôt que lui, né avec lui.' *De la Sagesse*, ed. 1618, Bk. II, ch. 3, p. 353.

⁴ Prior, *op. cit.*, pp. 60, 61, 62.

This saying is not, as one might expect, taken from one of Molière's plays, but from La Mothe Le Vayer himself; it is one of those racy and picturesque expressions likely to catch the dramatist's eye and remain in his memory. Wisdom, then, for all these thinkers, sceptics and Epicureans alike, lies in a reasoned and self-disciplined obedience to Nature's laws.

Charron was not merely the philosopher of 'prud'hommie' and the theorist of 'Nature'; he had drawn up the beginnings of a sceptical philosophy of the type we associate with Le Vayer. He was indeed one of the first philosophers, following Pomponazzi and Montaigne, to separate sharply the domains of Faith and Reason. Reason, as Montaigne had shown, fails in the last resort to guide us to the truth¹; 'tout le savoir du monde,' says Charron, 'n'est que vanité et mensonge².' We must therefore have recourse to the higher enlightenment of faith; this is how Charron brought Pyrrhonism to the service of orthodox Christianity. He even went as far as elaborating a scheme whereby the Jesuit missionaries should convert the heathen to Pyrrhonism before revealing to them 'les principes de la chrétienté comme envoyés du ciel³.' La Mothe Le Vayer followed him; but he did far more than develop Charron's ideas. Drawing directly from the sceptics of antiquity, and even from St Paul, he made a complete re-examination of the subject; he disengaged Pyrrhonism from the somewhat ambiguous position it had occupied with Charron, and elaborated the theory of 'La sceptique chrétienne' with a clarity and precision which it had never yet possessed.

It now begins to appear that it is among the Pyrrhonists rather than the Gassendists that we must place the author of the *Misanthrope*. We have so long regarded him as an Epicurean that it is difficult to accustom our minds to another view. Nevertheless, the affinities we have already discovered between Molière's thought and that of Charron and La Mothe Le Vayer point definitely to the belief that he was a Pyrrhonist⁴, and every fresh discovery of analogy only confirms us in this view.

Was Molière then a sceptic?

If there is a play which we might expect to help us in the decision, it is *Le Mariage forcé* (1664) in which occurs Molière's famous treatment of the character of Marphurius. Sganarelle, it will be remembered, has arranged to marry the coquette Dorimène; but he has doubts regarding the wisdom of this step and so consults his neighbours: Pancrace, an

¹ *Apologue de Raymond Sebond*.

² *De la Sagesse*, Bk. II, ch. 2, p. 337.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ We do not know whether any of Gassendi's works had a place in his library, but we know for a certainty that he possessed copies of Montaigne and La Mothe Le Vayer. See Soulié, *op. cit.*, pp. 263 *et seq.*

exponent of the Aristotelian philosophy, then dominant in the schools, and Marphurius, a Pyrrhonist—both pedants. It is in Scene v that Marphurius is introduced. To the questions of the hesitant suitor he can only respond: ‘Cela est incertain ... Il n’est pas impossible.... Cela peut être.... Je ne sais.’—‘Is it advisable for me to marry?’ insists Sganarelle.—‘Je n’en sais rien.’ ‘Shall I incur the misfortune of married men?’—‘La chose est faisable.’ Sganarelle then loses his temper: he gives the sceptic a sound beating, then mocks his outcry, feigning scepticism as to whether his victim has been touched. The first part of this scene, as everyone is aware, was imitated from the episode in the *Tiers Livre* of Rabelais, where Panurge consults the Pyrrhonist Trouillogan on the same question, and it is in particular the *Continuation des Responses de Trouillogan, philosophe ephectique et pyrrhomen*, which supplied the inspiration for the dialogue. What is perhaps less well known is the fact that the question had also been treated in the ninth Dialogue of Orasius Tubero, *Sur le Mariage*. Here Eleus, who is uncertain whether to marry, consults two philosophers, one a bachelor and the other a married man. The bachelor is in favour of marriage; while the married man strongly urges celibacy; and this is the course which is made to appear the wiser. This dialogue, curiously enough, does not conclude on the note of ‘suspension d’esprit,’ which is usual with Le Vayer.

It will be observed that whereas Panurge seeks the advice of a large number of persons, including a theologian, a doctor, a jurist and a philosopher, and is finally sent by Triboulet to consult the ‘Dive Bouteille’ itself, Sganarelle, like the Eleus of Le Vayer, consults only two philosophers. Why an Aristotelian and a Pyrrhonist? Because, of all schools of thought, these two were the furthest removed from each other. The former was strongly entrenched in the University; while, since the time of Pomponazzi, no group of thinkers had attacked the Aristotelians more persistently than the Pyrrhonists: examples of their animosity could be quoted from *La Mothe Le Vayer* himself; and everyone will recall that Pascal, in referring to the two types of thought presenting the widest dichotomy, identifies them with dogmatism and Pyrrhonism. Molière did not take a philosopher from each of these sects because he necessarily despised them, or because, as M. Étienne thought, ‘they had become equally ridiculous in 1664¹’; but because they represented *extremes*, and it was necessary to bring out the comedy of extreme opinions. He, therefore, took two names from Italian Comedy, *Pangrazio* and *Mamphurius*; borrowed ideas from Rabelais and *La Mothe Le Vayer*;

¹ Étienne, *Essai sur La Mothe Le Vayer*, Rennes, 1849, p. 44.

but invented the completely comic turn of the beating of Marphurius and the amusing discomfiture of the sceptic by his own tactics.

What conclusion arises from the consultation with Marphurius? It is commonly held that this scene is a witty refutation of scepticism¹. It is nothing of the kind. In the first place Marphurius, unlike his rival, is willing from the outset to listen to Sganarelle. It is true he cannot tell whether the man will be well advised to marry Dorimène; but how should he know? He is wise in declining to be responsible for one of these serious decisions. It may be argued that he is derided; but it is still untrue to say that Molière is disproving Pyrrhonism. Sganarelle no more refutes Pyrrhonism by beating Marphurius than Dr Johnson refuted Berkeley's Idealism when he kicked the famous stone and hurt himself. The only difference is this, that while the testy doctor believed, in good faith, that he had proved his argument (showing his total lack of understanding of the issue), Molière knew very well that Sganarelle did not by a mere beating prove Pyrrho wrong. The sceptics did not deny the existence of phenomena: they merely asserted that, as we can know nothing of their real nature, we should adopt an attitude of reserve about them². In practical affairs custom may be followed³; but in the domain of thought, we must doubt all things, even our doubt. We may be sure that Molière had thought about these questions and was familiar with the Pyrrhonic attitude. His main object, in the scene with Marphurius, was comedy. It was a rollicking scene that enabled him to renew and improve upon a piece of broad humour culled from Rabelais and La Mothe Le Vayer. If he intended to refute anything, it was pedantry; but the humour of the scene is double-edged; it cuts Sganarelle as much as Marphurius; and it is not Sganarelle who wields the stick at the end of the play. We cannot therefore affirm, from a study of this rather bitter little *comédie-ballet*, that Molière would not have subscribed to Pyrrhonism as a system.

And if there is no evidence in this play for supposing that Molière was hostile to the tenets of Pyrrhonism, there is, in another, definite reason for believing that he actually favoured them. Like most of the sceptics, from Pyrrho to Le Vayer, he showed respect for existing institutions. On questions of theoretical morals and generally on metaphysics, he abstained from pronouncing judgment. He wholeheartedly agreed with Montaigne that 'la plus expresse marque de la Sagesse, c'est une éjouissance constante; son état est, comme des choses au-dessus de la lune,

¹ See Molière, *Grands Écrivains* ed., iv, p. 47, note 2.

² See, e.g., V. Brochard, *Les Sceptiques Grecs*, Paris, 1887, p. 56.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

toujours serein¹. Above all he advised that avoidance of extremes, that moderation in all things, which the sceptics practised along with most of the Greek philosophers. Here we may recall the well-known passage in which Cléante (who certainly speaks for Molière) not only condemns 'la fausse dévotion' of Tartuffe, but the excessive and unbalanced piety of Orgon:

Les hommes, la plupart, sont étrangement faits !
 Dans la juste nature on ne les voit jamais ;
 La raison a pour eux des bornes trop petites ;
 En chaque caractère ils passent ses limites,
 Et la plus noble chose, ils la gâtent souvent
 Pour la vouloir outrer et pousser trop avant².

M. Michaut sees in these words simply an expression of the *Nicomachean Ethics* as they were taught in the University and in the schools³—in other words, the official doctrine of Molière's day. This interpretation is tenable, but is it not strange that the same speech of Cléante should contain a virtual declaration of free-thought, we do not say of incredulity, and that there should be, throughout Molière's plays, so many indications of his intellectual independence? Don Juan's 'Je te le donne pour l'amour de l'humanité,' for example. And if Molière was no more than a disciple of Aristotle, how is it that when, in 1670, the Sorbonne appealed to the Parlement de Paris to defend the authority of Aristotle against the new doctrines, Cartesian, Epicurean and Pyrrhonian, which were making headway in intellectual circles—how is it that Molière bestirred himself to strike a blow on behalf of freedom of thought⁴? Bernier tells us that on this occasion he, Boileau and Molière planned a counter-attack, and that Molière himself had thought out a play designed to ridicule the Faculty out of this absurd piece of obscurantism⁵.

In the event nothing came of the move made by the fanatics of orthodoxy and Molière naturally held fire; but the fact that he had been prepared to act proves that he was no enthusiast for Aristotle. We are thus forced back on our previous theory. It is Pyrrhonian, and not Aristotelian ethics, which best explain his attitude.

We have spoken of Cléante and, in another connection, of Clitandre, but it is in Philinte, who is more of the abstract thinker than either of these, that we must seek the truest expression of Molière's thought. Ac-

¹ *Essais*, ed. 1595, I, 25.

² Act I, sc. v.

³ *La Jeunesse de Molière*, p. 77.

⁴ See Émile Magne, *Molière et l'Université*, printed with *Une Amie inconnue de Molière*, 4e éd., Paris, 1922, pp. 102-9.

⁵ 'Le Sieur Molière [Bernier tells us] observait toutes les démarches de ces messieurs, et se proposait de démêler toutes leurs intrigues dans une comédie qu'il préparait pour le divertissement de la Cour. Il avait, entre autres, un acteur avec de grandes mâchoires qui représentait merveilleusement l'original.' Quoted by Magne, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-5.

according to Philinte one can have too much rectitude, one can have an excess of virtue, whereas:

Il faut, parmi le monde, une vertu traitable;
A force de sagesse on peut être blâmable;
La parfaite raison fuit tout extrémité
Et veut que l'on soit sage avec sobriété.
Cette grande raideur des vertus des vieux âges
Heurte trop notre siècle et les communs usages...¹.

Philinte deprecates the Stoic ideal and takes up the sceptical attitude regarding virtue; but he goes much further than this, for we find him at the same time recommending the moral ideal which La Mothe Le Vayer had dwelt upon again and again in his writings, as in the *Dialogue sur la Philosophie Sceptique*, where he speaks of that 'réglée modération de mœurs et parfaite tranquillité d'esprit que donne notre seule Sceptique'²; in the *Dialogue sur la Diversité des Religions*, where he declares that 'la fin de notre Epoque [mental suspension] est de nous donner une raisonnable modération en toutes nos passions et une parfaite assurance en ce qui regarde les opinions'³; or, finally, and more clearly still, in *De la Vertu des Païens*, where he writes:

Le but où vise le Sceptique, et où il constitue son souverain bien, c'est de posséder une assiette d'esprit exempte de toute agitation par le moyen de l'*ataraxie* qui règle les opinions et de la *metriopathie* qui modère les passions, de telle sorte qu'il jouisse d'un parfait repos tant à l'égard de l'entendement que de la volonté. Or il n'y a, selon qu'il le conçoit, que la Seule Epoque ou suspension d'esprit qui puisse mettre le sien dans un si heureux état⁴.

It is evident that, while Alceste had been perusing the *Prose chagrine*, Philinte had made an attentive study of the philosopher's earlier works: that he had read them to such good effect that this urbane interpreter of Molière's thought had himself become a perfect type of the sceptic:

Oui, je vois ces défauts dont votre âme murmure
Comme vices unis à l'humaine nature,
Et mon esprit enfin n'est pas plus offensé
De voir un homme fourbe, injuste, intéressé,
Que de voir des vautours affamés de carnage,
Des singes malfaisants, et des loups pleins de rage⁵.

This is not only the attitude of Le Vayer; it is the ideal which the Greek sceptics had set before them, exactly as their historian, M. Victor Brochard, has defined it: 'Se replier sur soi-même, afin de donner au malheur le moins de prise possible; vivre simplement et modestement, comme les humbles, sans prétention d'aucune sorte; *laisser aller le monde et prendre*

¹ *Misanthrope*, Act I, sc. i.

² *Cinq Dialogues par Oratius Tubero*, Liège, 1673, p. 83 (1st ed., 1630).

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 403-4.

⁴ *De la Vertu des Païens* [1642], Seconde Partie, *De Pyrrhon et de la Secte Sceptique*. See *Œuvres*, ed. 1662, I, p. 658.

⁵ *Misanthrope*, Act I, sc. 1.

*son parti de maux qu'il n'est au pouvoir de personne d'empêcher; voilà l'idéal du Sceptique*¹. If Alceste with his idealism, his aspirations to sincerity, his hatred of deceit, his indignation against injustice, is the furthest removed from that saintly indifference advocated by Pyrrho and his disciples, Philinte, young as he is, has acquired all their lessons. He has learned resignation:

Le monde par vos soins ne se changera pas.

He would not leave Alceste lying in the ditch, as Pyrrho left Anaxarchus (who commended him for it); nor perhaps, if he were on a ship in peril from tempest, would he, like the philosopher of Elis, advise his terrified companions to cultivate the imperturbability of the pig which, in a corner of the deck, was making its meal of barley as usual². But he has adapted to the exigencies of a polite society and his own excellent heart as much of the Pyrrhonist as he can. He suffers neither in his love for Éliante, nor his friendship for Alceste; the vices and follies of his neighbours hardly ruffle his tranquillity. At the very most, moved by the news that Alceste has lost his lawsuit and will have to pay twenty thousand francs, he admits the injustice of life, he confesses that men should be different; but, he asks, is *this* a reason for withdrawing from their society, and do not these vices give us the means of exercising our philosophy? For, if all hearts were just and true, most of the human virtues would be useless³.

He can in fact emerge from that inhuman indifference to which the Pyrrhonist aspired. But he plainly cultivates it; and, in ordinary times, his imperturbability is worthy of Pyrrho himself:

Je prends tout doucement les hommes comme ils sont,
J'accoutume mon âme à souffrir ce qu'ils font,
Et je crois qu'à la cour, de même qu'à la ville,
Mon flegme est philosophe autant que votre bile⁴.

And that is why, in hours of need, and whenever the counsel of a cool head is required, this disciple of La Mothe Le Vayer is a tower of strength.

Looking back over Molière's life and the plays written after 1663, that is, from the time when the influence of the Pyrrhonian circle in the rue Traversière might be supposed to have sunk into his mind, we have noted that Le Vayer had already made many of the more striking observations and expressed the principal moral ideas which Molière was to put into his comedies. Was the dramatist indebted for these ideas to his friend? A few scattered similarities or parallels would prove nothing; but the cumulative evidence is such that only one conclusion is possible. No

¹ *Les Sceptiques Grecs*, Paris, 1887, pp. 44-5.

³ Act v, sc. i.

² *Ibid.*, p. 70.

⁴ Act i, sc. i.

doubt remains, in the light of this evidence, that Molière's moral philosophy, and his general attitude, were formed, more perhaps than he himself realised, by the now neglected writings of the old sceptic. The influence of Gassendi and the Epicureans upon Molière is a mere hypothesis resting on hearsay and probability; the influence of the Pyrrhonists, and in particular of La Mothe Le Vayer, is a demonstrable certainty.

Early in May, 1672, when Molière was producing *Les Femmes Savantes* in his theatre of the Palais-Royal, La Mothe Le Vayer passed away at the ripe age of eighty-nine. He died in his bed, after suffering that long decline which he had held to be more dreadful than execution on the Place de Grève. Mlle de Bussy, who had married in 1670 a Monsieur de Luynes, had disappeared from the scene; thus, for Molière, the death of the old sceptic meant the severance of the last living link with his friend the young Abbé. In the same summer, Molière himself fell seriously ill. Early in the following February, sick as he was, he appeared in the title-rôle of *Le Malade imaginaire*; convulsing the audience in his old style, rushing about the stage, and being, in the concluding ballet, triumphantly received into the Faculty as a qualified doctor. On the fourth night he had nearly played through this final scene when an attack of hæmorrhage came on. The sad story needs no retelling: he was carried home to die.

A. LYTTON SELLS.

DURHAM.

AN EDINBURGH PROSE TRISTAN: THE 'BRET'

To those who have followed the course of Tristan literature in recent years the description of yet another Tristan prose romance, or at least of another manuscript of the prose *Tristan*, may not be without interest. It will at any rate be another proof of the widespread pleasure taken, during the later Middle Ages, in this vast and heterogeneous compilation, in which the Celtic legends are mingled with romances of chivalry and adventure, together with mythological elements reminiscent of the romances of antiquity.

Among several Old French manuscripts (a *Perceval*, a *Roman de la Rose*, a *Troye*, Joinville, etc.), in the National Library of Scotland, formerly called the Advocates' Library, there is one to which special attention had been drawn by M. Paul Meyer as early as 1866, in the *Documents manuscrits de l'ancienne littérature de la France conservés dans les bibliothèques de la Grande Bretagne*¹, and in 1867 in his reports in the *Archives des Missions scientifiques et littéraires*². In his report on Edinburgh M. Meyer notes that Francisque Michel had in 1836 explored the Advocates' Library and had drawn attention not only to the *Perceval* of Chrestien de Troyes, but also to a manuscript of *Tristan*. This last work, said M. Meyer, was the compilation known under the name of the *Bret*, of which copies, two anyhow, existed in the Bibliothèque Nationale, then the Bibliothèque Impériale.

In 1890, M. E. Löseth, in his *Roman en prose de Tristan*³, mentions this manuscript, which I will call the Edinburgh *Bret*, as one to which he had not had access. In 1905, M. Meyer, in a private letter to Edinburgh, indicated the possible interest of this *Bret* and thought it would be worth comparing with M. Löseth's work and with the two manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale; and the work was then begun. In 1925, M. E. Vinaver, in his *Études sur le Tristan en prose*⁴, included the manuscript in his list of the prose Tristans and added notices in his Bibliographie critique. Recently, through the kindness of Mr W. H. Dickson, late curator of the Advocates' Library, I have been able to read the manuscript at the British Museum, and to copy a large part of it. I have compared it carefully, paragraph by paragraph, with the analysis in M. Löseth's book and also with considerable parts of the Paris manuscripts mentioned by M. Meyer, B.N. f. fr. 104 and 756. I now propose to offer a

¹ Pp. 104-7.

² 2^e série, iv, pp. 137, 140.

³ *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, fasc. 82, préface, p. iv, note.

⁴ Pp. 23, 51 (no. 33), and 76.

short description of the Edinburgh manuscript, to quote in full its prologue (folio 1), the opening incidents of the actual Tristan romance (folio 4), and part of the last folio, 196. I hope later to compare the contents in detail with M. Lôseth's analysis, noting omissions, additions and divergences, and thus bring, if it may be, a small stone to the construction of the Tristan edifice:

The Edinburgh *Bret* bears the number 19. 1. 3, in the manuscripts of the National Library of Scotland. In the *Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts* of the same Library, vol. III, Poetry and Romance, p. 671, its number is 163. It is a large in-folio of vellum, in size $14\frac{1}{2}$ inches by 11, with 196 folios and a vellum fly-leaf. It is written in triple columns of 60 lines each, except where *lais* or *chansons* are introduced. Its date is given in the catalogue as the early fourteenth century: M. Meyer, however, attributed it to the thirteenth century, and this opinion would seem to be supported by the copyist's observance of Old French declension, the masculine nominative form being usually distinguished from the objective. It was acquired by the Advocates' Library and bound in 1808, and an account for the binding is in existence, but there seems to be no clue at all to its previous history. The title on the first folio, *La Grant Istovre de mon Signor Tristan*, was evidently inserted later. The writing is uniform and distinct, but appears to be the work of two or more hands; on f. 145 the writing changes and becomes larger, over-running the line. The small capitals are coloured alternately red and blue, and spaces have been left at intervals throughout for more elaborately illuminated initials, which have, however, in no case been added. The manuscript is in fair condition but stained and discoloured in parts, 'assez endommagé,' as M. Meyer said. Four leaves, between ff. 172 and 173, have been cut out. F. 152 is nearly all blank, and a few other spaces have been similarly left. The last folio, 196, is much defaced, the concluding lines being indecipherable. The dialect appears to be that of Lorraine. Thus the infinitives and masculine past participles of the first conjugation end respectively in *-eir* and *-eit*, and the perfect third singular in *-ait*, e.g., *apeleir*, *apeleit*, *apelait*. This yod appears in many other words, modifying especially the vowels *a* and *e*: *pairt*, *teil*. A *w* frequently follows a *u* in hiatus, e.g., *venuwe*, *escuuvier*. There are many other dialectal traits, and these characteristics would, I think, be worthy of a special study in connexion with other works in the Lorraine dialect, such as the *Lorraine Psalter*, and perhaps the *Prise de Cordres et de Séville*. The dialectal peculiarities suggest the possibility that the manuscript may have been brought to Scotland in the train of the Guise family.

As to the name of the manuscript, in the catalogue it is called 'the first part of the prose romance of *Tristan* by Lucès de Gast (here called Sire (*sic*) Lucès dou Gat), with the second part as enlarged by Hélie de Borron, with a short prologue... This first part, i.e., of Lucès dou Gat, ends on f. 152.... The second part as enlarged by Hélie de Borron begins on f. 153.' With regard to the authorship, it may be worth while recalling that Gaston Paris considered these names Lucès du Gast and Hélie de Borron as probable fictions. In *Romania* for 1886¹ he says: 'Quant à Luce du Gast, l'auteur prétendu de la rédaction primitive du roman en prose (de *Tristan*), rien ne s'oppose à ce qu'il ait existé et écrit un livre quelconque sur *Tristan*; mais il est certainement impossible de démêler ce qui peut être de lui dans l'immense et indigeste compilation à laquelle son nom est aujourd'hui attaché avec celui du prétendu Elie de Borron.' And in the same article: 'En maint autre passage l'ignorance et l'audace de ces remanieurs pseudonymes se décèlent assez manifestement.'

The authorship of the *Tristan* in prose remains obscure; some 'ignorant and audacious' improver, with an eye to the changed literary fashions of the first third of the thirteenth century, seems to have adapted the lost poem of Chrestien de Troyes on *Tristan* to the tastes of his time, as the prose *Lancelot* is founded apparently on the *Chevalier de la Charrette* of Chrestien.

As for the title 'li Bret,' this is the name given to the romance in the prologue to the Edinburgh manuscript, as it is also to the manuscript 104 of the Bibliothèque Nationale and I believe to other *Tristan* manuscripts of the thirteenth century. The following is the prologue of the Edinburgh *Bret*:

Ci comancet la grant ystoire de monsignor *Tristan*, ke messires Lucès dou Gat et messires Helins (*sic*) de Boron translaterent dou latin en romans, por ceu que nulz n'an prenoit a translateir ci halte ystoire com de celui qui estoit li muedres chivellers dou monde, ne qui onques fust en la grant Bretagne ne davant lou roy Artu ne apres, fors Galaad tant soulemant, et apelerent entre aulz cest livre li Bret, pour ceu qu'il est aci comme maistres sor tous les livres qui onques furent fais de la Tauble Reonde ne dou Graal, et commansait premierement messires Lucès dou Gat, que briement pairlait tant com il vesquit et dist en teil maniere.

Après la passion Jhesu Crist avint que Joseph de Harimatic vint en la grant Bretagne per lou commant nostre Signor et en cristiennait grant partie. Joseph avoit i. sien cerorge qui estoit apeleis Brons. Cil Brons avoit .xii. filz. Il vint a Joseph et se li dist: Sire, je ai .xii. filz, je voldroie que vous parlexiés a ealz et lor demandissés c'il se vodront mairieir, ou qu'il vodront faire. Dont vint Joseph a ealz et lor demandait c'il se vodroient mairieir. Et distrent li .xi. que oil; et li dousimes dist qu'il ne se mairieroit pais, ains serviroit a S. Graal et seroit² virgines. Dont t'an donrai je apres ma mort la gairde, fait Joseph. Et cil estoit apeleis Helains li grans³. Li dis furent mairieis per lou consoil Joseph, et li onzimes dist qu'il se mairieroit a sa volanteit, et cil estoit apeleis Sadoc. Apres ceu s'an departit Joseph.

¹ *Romania*, xv, p. 600.

³ MS. *grns*; B.N. 756 *gros*.

² MS. *serant*.

The explanation of the title *Bret* 'pour ceu qu'il est aci comme maistres sor tous les livres qui onques furent fais de la Tauble Reonde ne dou Graal,' is obscure. It would seem as though the author himself did not know why it was used. The name *Brait* (the two spellings are frequent) belonged originally to the Merlin romance¹. Grober, in his *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, seems to consider the Merlin *Brait* as entirely unconnected with the Tristan *Livre du Bret*². The Merlin *Brait* Grober finds surviving in a Spanish romance, *Baladro*, printed in 1498, for which he supposes a lost French model to which the name of Elie or Helye must have been attached. The title in the Merlin romance refers to the cry (*brait* from *brave*) of Merlin at his death or in his entombment in the cave. Gaston Paris considers that the word under the form *Bret* was appropriated by the compiler of the prose *Tristan*, who called himself 'Elie de Boron,' thus attaching himself to Robert de Boron: he found the word 'Bret' in the Merlin story, in which Tristan played some part, not knowing the meaning of the word, and profiting by the fact that the pseudo-Robert de Boron, in the continuation of Merlin, had said he could only compass part of his 'matiere' and would leave 'une branke a mon compaignon maistre Helie,' he applied 'Bret' to the Tristan romance, the authorship of which he claimed³.

After the prologue which I have quoted in full, in the Edinburgh manuscript as elsewhere, there is a long series of events occurring before the birth of Tristan, to which G. Paris, in speaking of the prose *Tristan* in general, alludes as 'une introduction aussi ennuyeuse que longue et inutile sur les ancêtres de Tristan, farcie de réminiscences mythologiques et de fictions d'une monotone absurdité⁴.' In the Edinburgh *Bret* this occupies nearly four folios. It follows in the main the same thread as the Paris manuscript B.N. 756, which is also the basis of the first part of Löseth's analysis⁵, but there are many omissions, additions and differences of detail and of language. On f. 4 v. *a* we come at last to the immediate origin of Tristan.

The King of France gives Loenois, together with Cornuaille which has just lost its king, to the son of Apollo, the former King of Loenois⁶. The Edinburgh manuscript continues as follows:

(f. 4 v. *b*) (Li contes) parollet de l'anfant Apollo, qui estoit apeleiz Serades. Et dist li contes que tant lou fist norrir Cloevis qu'il en fist roi de Cornuaille et de Loenois, et regnait grant temps. Li rois li donnait une soie fille qui avoit a non Eresille. Il orent

¹ *Merlin*, Soc. Anc. Textes Fr. II, p. 57.

² Grober, *op. cit.*, II, p. 1006 (Französische Literatur).

³ *Romana*, xv, 600.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 600.

⁵ B.N. 756, *Leonors*.

⁶ E. Löseth, *Roman en prose de Tristan*, pp. 3 et seq.

.xii. fils; li anneis avoit a non Cricides, et fut sires de Cornuaille; li onzime ot Loenois; li .x. s'an portarent, dont li contes ne fait ores plus mencion. Mais tant alait li royaume de Cornuaille d'oir en oir que uns rois i fut qui avoit non Felix, malvais rois. Car il haoit tous, malvais hommes et les gentis aci. Et por ceu fut il mahigné a dairien. Il ot .ii. fils et .iii. filles; li uns des fils avoit nom March, et li altres Parneham. Et a mal de la mort fist il lou roi March coroneir, et si donnait une de ses filles a roi Melhadou que roi estoit de Loenois. Et celle estoit apellee Elyabel et estoit l'annee. Longuemant furent sans anfans avoir, entre lou roi Melhadou et sa femme, et après fut grosse la royne. Un jor avint que li rois alait chassier, si perdit toute sa compaignie. A soir l'ancontrait une damoizelle que l'amoit, et ei com elle l'aloit querant elle lou trouvait davant une fontenne, se li dist que c'il estoit hardis elle li mousteroit une aventure. Et il dist qu'il yroit avec li. Et elle l'an moimant¹ tant qu'il vinxent en un tor, ci² lou fait celle entreir en une chambre, et tout maintenant qu'il fut antreis dedens il fut si anchanteis durement qui obhait toutes choses fors ley. Sa gent lou quistrent aisseis, mais il n'an porent point trouver. La royne Elyabel meysmemant l'alait querre toute soule d'une damoiselle tant soulemant. Et li avint qu'elle trouvait Merlin en la fourest que li dist que li rois estoit tous sains et tous haitiés, mais plus ne li dist acelle fois, si s'en alait atant et celle remeist.

Quant la dame vit ceste choze, elle commancet moult grant duel a faire, et tant se tormantet que li mal de son³ ventre la prent; si travaillait toute la nuit et a l'andemai ot enfant. Quant il fut neis se fut .i. fils. La dame lou demandat a voir, et la damoizelle lou moustrait. Et dist la dame por ceu que de toute⁴ tristor avoit esteit triste a l'anfanteir, auroit il a nom Tristans. Et tout maintenant qu'elle ot ceu dit⁵ ce fut morte. Et la damoizelle comancet moult fort a crieir.

Atant es vos celle pairt venir .ii. chivelliers qui parans ieirent a roi Melyadou. Quant il virent ceste choze si dist li uns, La royne est morte et li rois est perdus; occions cest anfant, si averons le teire. Ha! fait la damoizelle, por Deu ne l'ocieis mies, mais donneiz lou moi et je vos jurrai sor sains que jamais ne lou vairois. Et il li donnent. Et puis en portent lou cors de la royne a la citeit si la moustrerent as gens. Et quant les dames la voient elles dient qu'elle est morte d'anfant; Randre lou vos covient ou mort ou vif. Et il dient qu'il n'an virent point. Et tut dient que rendre lor covient.

Atant ez vos venus Merlin qui lor dist, Preneis ses .ii. chivelliers. Donc lor contet command il vouloient occire l'anfant, por coi cil furent si esbahis qu'il en connurent toute la veriteit, si furent pris et mis en pixon. Et Merlins dist as barons qu'il aillent a chaistel de la roche a la tor, si trouveront lor signor illuec, que la damoizelle de leans tient per son anchantement. Et prandeis, fait Merlins, se li faites deffaire son anchantement, et puis l'ocieis. Et il li demandent qui il est, mais il ne lor vuet mies dire. Donc s'an vont a grant compaignie de chivillers. Et Merlins commandet a ceuls de leans qu'il faicent joie. Après apellet .i. damoizel qui estoit neis de Galles, et estoit apeleis Governas, si estoit de haut lynaige estrais. Amns, fait il, se tu voloies gardeir loiamant l'oir de Loenois, je lou te randerai. Et il li creantet loiamant qu'il n'aurait jai mal ou qu'il puisse (*sic*). Et je lou te bailleraï donc tout errant, fait Merlins.

Atant se pairtent de leans et font tant qu'il viennent a la fontenne Brehaigne, si trouverent illuec .i. pairon ou il avoit lettres escrites qui disoient, Si rendront li .iii. boins chivelliers pairlemant. Après i avoit altres qui disoient, Galaas, Lancelos, Tristans. Or saichies tout certainnement, fait Merlins, que tu garderais l'un de cez .iii., et garde lou bien.

Que vos diroie je? Tant fist Merlins qu'il trouvait la damoizelle que avoit jai fait crestienneir l'anfant, et lou fist raporteir en la citeit d'Albine.

Quant li rois Melyadou que jai estoit revenus vit l'anfant, si fut moult liés. Et quant les gens virent Merlin, il distrent a roi, Sire, cist nos ait fait delivrez. Et li rois l'an mercliet moult durement. Et Merlins dist que ce n'estoit mies por lui mais por son fil qui aucores seroit proudons. Lors li demandet li rois que il est, et il dist qu'il est Merlins. Et saichies, fait il, que je t'ai delivreit por l'amor de ton fil. Or me dites, fait li rois, c'il vaudrait. Et il dist qu'il vaudrait tout son lignaige. Mais garde bien

¹ MS. *moimant*.² MS. *cil*.³ MS. *desor*.⁴ MS. *toutes*.⁵ MS. *dite*.

qu'il n'ait altre maistre que Govenal. Et quant Merlins ot ceu dit, il s'an vet, et dist a roi qu'il saichet se li anfes est crestiens. Et li rois lou demandet, et la damoizelle dist oil, et ait nom Tristans. Et tout maintenant lou baille li rois a Govenal, et li dist qu'il lou garst loiamant. Et cil dist qu'il en ferait tout son pooir. Mais atan^z taist ores li contes de ceste choze et retornet a roi March de Cornuaille.

After this account of the birth of Tristan and the appointment of Govenal as his 'maistre,' the story in the main is the same as that outlined by Loseth, but with many variants, with one episode not found to my knowledge elsewhere, and with one long gap.

With regard to the variants, Löseth's paragraphs 71 (last part), 72, 73, 74, and 75 have no counterpart in the Edinburgh *Bret*; this latter relates, in ff. 46-55, the adventures, found in MSS. 104 and 756, which are put into long footnotes by Löseth¹. Before this divergence (the demoiselle *mesdisant*, Brunor and Mordret have arrived at a cross where the road forks) there comes in the Edinburgh *Bret* an episode which is not found in the two Paris manuscripts, nor is it mentioned by Loseth². It concerns the adventures of the demoiselle *mesdisant* and the chevalier *a la cotte mal taillée* after Mordret leaves them, and their contact with the hostile inhabitants of the castle formerly belonging to the giant Brudalgans. As for the gap in the Edinburgh manuscript, when the narrative has reached the anniversary of the death of the Morhout in the Isle of Saint Samson (Löseth, p. 123), there is a blank already noticed (Ed. f. 152 v.) and the story is taken up, on f. 153 r. b, after omitting episodes which occupy 136 pages in Löseth's analysis (pp. 123-259) and which relate the life of the lovers in Cornwall, Tristan's adventures in Brittany, and various incidents connected with King Arthur's knights.

After the gap, the Edinburgh *Bret* continues the story, with variants as before, as far as the beginning of the Quest of the Holy Graal, f. 196 (Löseth, pp. 276-7). This is the part upon which, according to Professor Vinaver³, we must rely in order to decide whether a given Tristan prose romance belongs to Version I (the primitive) or Version II (the cyclic). If the Quest is resumed, the manuscript belongs to Version I; if the Quest is interpolated in its entirety, then the manuscript derives from Version II. Unfortunately the Edinburgh *Bret* stops short at the beginning of the Quest, and at the end of the part considered by M. Loseth as an interpolation common to all manuscripts except B.N. 757. This is the point where there are signs that the divergent forms of the romance are beginning to meet. It is the more to be regretted that the Edinburgh *Bret* does not go far enough to show whether the Quest will be resumed or

¹ Loseth, *op. cit.*, sections 71 a (last part), 72 a, 73 a, 74 a, 75 a.

² *Vide* B.N. 104, f. 118; B.N. 756, f. 113; Loseth, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

³ E. Vinaver, *Études sur le Tristan en prose*, pp. 27-31.

interpolated, that is, whether we are dealing with a copy of Version I or of Version II. Moreover, a good deal of the last folio is indecipherable. Parts of this last folio are given below.

(F. 196 r b) Tristans li boins fait a celui temps si haltes euvres qu'il est renommes sor tous. Quant li rois March oit parler de ces fais il en tremblet tous de paour. Quar doutance ait que Tristans ne reperset en Cornuaille Quar il li avoit tant meffait par maintes fois que il avoit doutance s'il retornoit qu'il ne le feist a honte morir.

Grans est li paors que li rois March ait de Tristan por les proesses de lui, et por ceu qu'il est sires dou roiaume de Logres et ameis en la maison dou roi Artu et chier tenus del lignage le roi Ban. Quant on li contet ces nouvelles de Tristan il en tramblet toz de paor

Quant cil de Loenois oient parler de la grant bonteit Tristan il le viennent veoir et li requierent doucement qu'il s'en revignent en son roiaume por ces hommes qui trop sont desirant de lui veoir Mais il lor dist qu'il n'i irait pais a ceste fois. Il ne touldroit en nulle guise le roiaume a celui cui il l'avoit donneit. Et il estoit sens faille veriteus qu'il avoit toute sa terre donnee a Gouvernal son maistre. Et li avoit donnee a femme une soie coisine germane, si que Gouvernal estoit rois et celle roine. Et por ceu dist il qu'il n'iroit pais en Loenois orendroit, ains demourrait en la Joieuse Garde de tout l'esteit et tout l'iver. Mais l'autre esteit, si com il dit, s'en irait il en Loenois veoir le roi Gouvernal, et ses amis Et de lai retournerait il com il dist en Cornuaille.

Ensi dist il qu'il le ferait. Et cil de Cornuaille en sont merveille liet Enci com il disoit l'eust il fait l'esteit après, mais il ne pot, quar li grant queste Saint Greal fuit lors emprize et commansiee, ou tui li compaignons de la Table Reonde se mistrent. Et il meismes se mist adonc. Et par ceste queste perdit il madame Yseut, et li rois March la recovrait. Mais or laisserons a parler de celui conte et tornerons sor une altre matiere

(O)r dist li conte que quant cil de Loenois se furent aperceus que Tristans demouroit an la Joieuse Garde, il repartirent en lor pans. Et Tristans demorait a la Joieuse Garde a teil joie et a teil desduit com je vos ai conteit. Et i demorait tout celui esteit et tout l'iver tant que li novialz temps fuit repairies antor la Pasque, que cil bois commansent a renverdir, et que cil oisealz commansent lor douz chans de maintes manieres.

Adonc en celle saison a Pasque tout droitement vint uns proudoms hermites et religious durement et por cui Deus faisoit maintes vertus, et fist assavoir a roi Artu que a la Pentecoste que devoit estre vanroit li Sains Vaissialz en sa maison, celui meismes que on appelloit Greal, et repaistroit de viande sante toz les chivelliers de son osteil. Et a celui point moustreroit Deus maint bel miracle en la maison a lou roi Artu, teil que onques mais n'avoient esteit veu enz maison d'autre roi.....

(f. 196 v. a) Et bien sachent il de voir que a ceste feste vauront il le boin chivellier, celui qui doit acomplir le siege perillous de la Table Reonde, ou chivellier ne s'estoit ancor assis que de celui siege se levaist onques si mors non ou malignies. Et saichent tuit que l'ystore dou Saint Greal tesmognet que an la Table Reonde avoit siege ou maint chivellier se vorent asseoir, si assistrent. Mais nulz ne assist au temps le roi Artu ne davant que ne moruist maintenant qu'il ne s'i estoit assis, jusqu'a tant que li boins Galaaz vint, li boins chivelliers, li mueldres chivelliers qui onques portoit armes ou roiaume de Logres. Cil s'i assist, et par celui fuit li nevres a acomplir acomplis. Et cil s'i reposait et s'en partit samement, ensi com a Nostre Signor plot. Et qui voldrait savoir por qil signefiance li sieges avoit esteit ordeneis par le sen Merlm, si voit le livre monsignor Robert de Boron. Quar il le deviset moult clerement et le monstret tout apertement, ensi com li halte hystore dou Saint Greal le nous fait antandant.

Quant li rois Artus ot oie ceste nouvelle que li sains hermites li ot fait antandant, sachies qu'il en fuit lies et joians moult merveilleusement, et s'en retornait a Kamaaloth erramment. Or fist faire lettres, et les envoiait par tout le roiaume de Logres, et mandait a tous cealz que terre tenoient de lui que ne laissassent en nulle maniere qu'il ne fuissent la velle de la Pentecoste a Kamaaloth. Et que bien sourent il qu'il voldroit tenir la plus riche cort, la plus halte et la plus anvoisiee qu'il eust onques tenue jor de

sa vie. La cort qu'il avoit tenue a son coronnement estoit noians envers cest (altre?) qu'il voldroit tenir a ceste fois. Ensi mandait li rois Artus a toz ceulz que de lui tenoient terre et qui a temps pooient venir a la feste. Li rois Artus fist si grant apparail por ceste feste que jamais homs mortelz si grant apparail ne ferait por une feste.....

(f. 196 v. b) Cil bons chivelliers, qui Galaaz estoit appeleiz et qui fist les grans mervelles d'armes eu roiaume de Logres et en toutes terres, et por cui Deus tant de miracles fist apertement, fuit filz Lancelot dou Lac, et l'engendrât en la fille dou roi Pelles.

Grans fuit li aparailz et li feste. Messires Tristans, qui en la Joiouse Garde demoroit avec la roïne Yseut, estoit aques apairilliés entor la Pasque, et avoit grant volanteit d'aleir en Loenor. Et la roïne Yseut si estoit bien acordee. Mais pues que Tristans antandit que li rois anvoiroit lettres par tout a ceulz qui de lui tenoient terre, et lor mandoit (k)il tenroit la cort a Kamaaloth la (plus) riche qu'il onques tenist, quant Tristans ot ces nouvelles il dist qu'il ne se movrait dou roiaume de Logres davant qu'il aurait veu ceste cort. Et por ceu remest il, adont qu'il penset bien qu'il vanrait halte chivellerie. Il demandet a madame Yseut si elle irait a ceste cort ou toutes les dames de halt lignaige seront. Sire, fait elle, salve vostre graice je n'i irai pais, vos porois bien aller se il vos plaist, por ceu que vos estes compains de la Table Reonde. Dame, fait il, atant vos laisserai je si loing de moi? Vos revendrois tost, fait elle, si Deus plaist.

Dame, fait il, pues que vos n'i voleis venir, je n'i irai pais. Si, fait elle, si ferois, et vos dirai pourquoi je voi que vos y aillés et si demourai je a anut sens vos. Je ai tant de ceste cort oit parlet as uns et as autres que je sai vraiment que ceste cors serai et li plus riches et li plus halte que onques fuist tenue el roiaume de Logres. Bien sai que tut chivellier de la Table Reonde i seront. Et quant il seront donc tut a ceste feste, et vos, amis, qui estes li plus preus de tous et li mueldres chivelliers dou monde n'i seriés, que diroient li donc? Il vos tendroient a malvais et diroient que vos seriés recreans de bien faire por l'amor de la roïne de Cornuaille: il diroient que vos averiés abaissiet toute chivellerie por moi. Vos en seriez abonteiz et j'en seroie deshonorée. Or esgardez s'il est donc bien que nos (oussions) cest blasme. Madame, fait Tristans, grant mercit de ceu que vos me faites assavoir l'onor de moi. Or ce ferai je certainement.... (f. 196 v. c is mostly indecipherable.)

Thus the manuscript ends with the beginning of the Quest of the Holy Graal, and with the approaching festival and tournament to celebrate Whitsuntide at the court of King Arthur, which Yseut insists that Tristan must attend, or they will both be dishonoured.

Though the Edinburgh *Bret* ends too soon for us to apply Professor Vinaver's touchstone (the particular treatment of the Quest story), it seems to follow the same version as B.N. 756 with many divergences of detail, one long omission and one considerable addition. The divergences might well be the subject of further study. In the meantime it is perhaps not too bold to surmise that the manuscript belongs to Version II (the cyclic) of Professor Vinaver's classification¹, and should probably be placed on the upper part of the line from which B.N. 756 is a branch, since it has common features not only with that manuscript but also with B.N. 104.

It should be added that there are six 'lais' introduced into the Edinburgh *Bret*, all of which are noted in Lóseth's analysis. Their linguistic forms alone would be worth separate examination. The first lines of these

¹ Vinaver, *Études sur le Tristan en prose*, pp. 31-4.

'lais' are as follows: On f. 58 r., 'J'ai fait chansonetes et lais' (le 'lay mortel') sung by Tristan in the Forest of Morois (published by Fr. Michel, *Tristan*, II, p. 212); on f. 73 r., 'Li solois luist et clers et biaux' sung by Iseut (published by Bartsch, *Chrestomathie de l'ancien français*, pp. 149-52); f. 96 r., 'Amors a vos, ains qu'a nelui,' sung by Kahedin's harper before Iseut, f. 96 v., 'Folie n'est pais vasaige' given by Iseut to the harper for Kahedin; f. 97 v., 'En morant de si doulce mort,' sent by Kahedin to Iseut, and f. 194 v., 'D'amors viennent li doulz penseir,' composed and sung by Tristan's rival, Palamides. All show considerable variants when compared with the forms given them in the Paris manuscripts.

The prose *Tristan* has seemed to many critics 'une immense et indigeste compilation,' 'indigne de sa source et de son titre,' a barbarous transformation of the beautiful primitive story, the poetry of courtly love reduced to the value of a 'fait divers'.¹ Yet the forty-eight manuscripts bear witness to its popularity in its time; it is a social and literary record, to be studied for its very defects as well as for its intrinsic interest. No one in modern times has been found bold enough to publish the romance *in extenso*, indeed any one who has ventured into the domain of the *Bret* may appreciate the allusion in B.M. Additional 12. 228, in which the compiler of this vast work returns hearty thanks for the joy of its completion, 'à Dieu qui m'a doné pooir et engin et force et memoire de finer honorablement le lyvre del Bret, entor cui ge ai un tens travillis ententivement.'

F. C. JOHNSON.

LONDON.

¹ *Vide Vinaver, op. cit., Avant-propos and p. 13.*

THE POSITION OF THE GENITIVE IN GERMAN

IN vol. IV of his *Deutsche Syntax*, § 1566, O. Behaghel has given a historical account of the position of the non-partitive genitive dependent on a noun in German. He distinguishes three stages in the development of the position of the genitive. At first in all the Germanic languages the genitive preceded the governing noun, except when this position was disturbed by the 'Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder,' a law which Behaghel claims to have discovered and which is simply that the longer group of words tends to follow the shorter. The second stage is that the non-personal genitives are removed behind the governing noun whilst the personal genitives retain their original position, and finally the common personal nouns are also transferred behind the governing noun. Behaghel then attempts to establish these principles by statistics from the earliest texts in Germanic to Modern German. He finds that at the end of the Old High German period (Notker) the personal nouns were still placed before the noun, whilst the non-personal nouns could follow the governing noun although the normal position was still before the noun. Behaghel is unable to find any increase in the genitives after the noun between the Gothic Bible and Notker, although according to his statistics the number is slightly larger in Notker than in Isidor and Tatian.

The chief difficulty with the Gothic and O.H.G. texts is to eliminate the influence of the order of words of the original Greek or Latin and thus arrive at the free order of words in German. Although Behaghel does not explain his methods, an examination of his statistics shows that he only includes those examples where the translator has reversed the Greek or Latin order or has used a genitive where there is none in the original. This method is in principle correct, although it has certain limitations which will be discussed later.

Behaghel has also excluded those examples which follow his 'Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder,' that is those examples of a genitive following the noun where the genitive is longer than the governing noun. I follow him in this, excluding especially those examples where the genitive is qualified by an adjective or has another genitive dependent on it or where there are two genitives dependent on the same noun and connected by a conjunction. In these cases the genitive expression is usually much longer than the governing noun.

In the Gothic Bible Behaghel finds 8 examples of the genitive of a personal noun placed before the governing noun and 5 examples of the

genitive following. In one of these five (*all gawi bisitande*, Luke iv, 14) the genitive follows because Gothic was averse to placing the genitive between the adjective and noun. In the other four, Luke viii, 41, 49 *fauramaþleis synagogais*, Luke xix, 2 *fauramaþleis motarje* and 2 Cor. xi, 32 *fauramaþleis þrudos* the translator has used a Latin text and followed the Latin order of words. In Gothic therefore the personal genitive preceded the governing noun.

Of the non-personal nouns Behaghel finds 10 examples of the genitive preceding the noun and 5 following and concludes that the different treatment of the personal and non-personal genitive had already begun in Gothic. A consideration of these 5 examples shows, however, that there is no certain example of the Gothic genitive following the noun and it is strange that Behaghel has not considered, in two of the instances at least, the influence of the Latin text, when he has used this method to explain away the personal genitives following the noun. The five examples are:

(i) Luke i, 70 *fram anastodeinar awwis*, where the order is clearly that of the Latin, *a principio temporis*.

(ii) Col. ii, 16 *in dailai dagis dulþars*, which again follows the Latin, *diei festi*.

(iii) 1 Tim. iv, 13 *sagga boko*, translating the Greek ἀνάγνωσις. In this case the translator is repeating the order of words in an earlier passage where the verb ἀναγινώσκειν is translated by *saggan bokos*. In the introduction to his edition of the Gothic Bible (p. xlv) Streitberg has stressed the importance of such parallel passages in the Gothic Bible.

(iv) and (v) John viii, 51, 52 *aiwa dage*. This I consider to be a partitive genitive, and as Behaghel has shown (*Syntax*, § 1565) the partitive genitive originally followed the noun in Germanic.

Rejecting examples (i) and (ii) where the Latin influence is clear there are only three doubtful examples of the genitive following the noun in Gothic, and it is by no means so certain as Behaghel maintains that the distinction between personal and non-personal nouns had begun in Gothic. Even if my explanation of the three doubtful examples be rejected, the proportion is much less than Behaghel claims.

In Isidor¹, as Behaghel shows, the personal nouns still precede the governing nouns, with a few exceptions.

(i) Behaghel finds 7 examples of the word *gotes* following the noun, which he explains from the fact that *dei* or *domini* almost exclusively follows the noun in the Latin text, although not in the 7 references

¹ The references are throughout to Hench's edition of Isidor.

which he quotes. Of these 7 references M 34,5 and 40,5 do not contain the word *gotes* at all and should be omitted, but the list should be increased by 13,5 *umbi dhea bauhnunga dhero dhrjo heideo gotes = de trinitatis significantia*. This, however, is only a correction of detail and does not affect Behaghel's principle.

(ii) Behaghel finds one other example of a personal noun following the noun, 24,12 *dhaz chiscrip dhero folcho*. To this should be added, omitted by Behaghel, 42,4 *in mltnisso chundo* and M 33,1 *az aucsiuni manno*. These few exceptions are, however, not sufficient to upset Behaghel's theory.

From Behaghel's account of the position of the non-personal genitive in O.H.G. I differ considerably.

In the Isidor Behaghel finds 22 examples of the genitive preceding the noun compared with 6 following, from which he concludes that Isidor was nearer to the original Germanic usage in this respect than the Gothic Bible. I find 43 examples in Isidor of the genitive preceding the noun, contrary to the Latin or where there is no genitive in Latin. In view of the considerable discrepancy between my figures and Behaghel's I give the references in full, together with any necessary correction of Behaghel's references. Although Behaghel states that there are 22 examples of the genitive preceding the noun, his list contains only 21 references. Of these 21, the reference 19,15 *mit sumes chirunes wagu* should not be included as the German follows the Latin order (*sub quadam mystervii lance*). The list is thus reduced to 20 examples, but should be increased by the following 23 examples:

1,2 *himilo garawi*; 1,6 *erdha stedila*; 4,15 *rehtnissa garda*; 4,20 *mit frewidha olee*; 5,11 *fona dhes chrismen salbe*; 6,1 *aerdhrihhes hruomege*; 15,7 *snes mundes gheiste*; 17,22 *eochihwelihhes dhero heideo sundric undarscheit*; 22,6 *in fleisches lihhe*; 22,13 *frido herosto*; 26,22 *untaz dhuu selbun christes chumfti ziidh*; 29,8 *fona paradises bliidhnissa*; 29,16 *zi rehtnissa werchum*; 30,7 *dhurah weraldr aloosnin*; 30,9 *bi muttingardes nara*; 30,17 *sinera manniscnissa chuburt*; 36,13 *after fleisches mezsse*; 36,18 *dhinera womba waxmin*; 40,16 *after augono chisvune*; 40,16 *orono chihlose*; 42,12 *dhera christinheidi chrihha*; 42,16 *after fleisches mezsse*; M 33,13 *ano ewmgero zuteo bigin*.

Turning now to the 6 examples which Behaghel finds of the genitive following, I find:

(i) 31,12 *wehsal dhes nemin* should not be included as it clearly follows the Latin order—*mutatio nominis*.

(ii) 43,10 *bi sculdim dhero stedi*. I am quite at a loss to explain why

Behaghel includes this here. In the first place the MS. and Hench's text have *dheru* not *dhero*, and there is no other example of either *dhero* or *dheru* as the gen. sing. fem. of the article in Isidor. *dheru stedi* is a dative translating the Latin *ei*. I give the relevant passage in full: *ut accepto quod redempti pro morte eius gloriam ei exhibemus, etiam locus... = dhera alosnin wrdhar sinemu dodhe bi sculdim dheru stedi aerliihho era beremes. Joh auk dhiu selba stat... = 'grateful for the redemption through his death we do all honour to the place. And also the same place...'* This is clearly not an example of a genitive at all.

(iii) 35,12 *in uzssondem endum oostarruihhes waldendan = in extremis orientis partibus regnum tenere*. It is true that the order of the Latin genitive and noun is here reversed, but nevertheless the Latin order determines the German. The translator has translated *regnum* twice, once with the verb, *regnum tenere = waldendan*, and once with *orientis*, *orientis regnum = oostarruihhes*. The order of *oostarruihhes* is therefore determined by the order of the Latin *regnum*. Another explanation is also possible. Hench (p. 183) regards *oostarruihhes* as dependent not on *endum* but on *waldendan*. This too is quite possible and in any case this example cannot be taken as evidence that the genitive followed the noun in O.H.G.

(iv) 19,17 *chraft dhes ebanwerches*. Although this is not an exact translation of the Latin, the Latin order is followed, *cooperationem potentiae*.

(v) 28,2 *dhiu blostar iro ghelstro*. Again, although there is no genitive in the Latin text, the Latin order may have influenced the German—*libamina et sacrificia*.

There remains one clear example in Isidor of a reversal of the Latin order, 17,8 *dhazs meghina charunn dhera dhrinissa = trinitatis mysterium*. The proportion of the two positions in Isidor is therefore 43 : 1 (or at the most 43 : 2, if (v) is included), and just as with the personal nouns this one example is not sufficient to prove that the distinction between personal and non-personal had begun in the earliest O.H.G. Behaghel's statement that the proportion of genitives following the noun was slightly less than one-third is incorrect.

Turning now to the Tatian, of which Behaghel investigates pp. 1–150 in Sievers' edition, it appears that the personal nouns were placed before the governing noun, except when the Latin order was followed¹.

¹ Behaghel gives a list of 28 references for the personal genitive preceding the noun. In this list 40,1 and 40,2 must be misprints as they do not contain a genitive at all, whilst 11,6 does not exist in my edition of the Tatian.

With regard to the non-personal genitives Behaghel finds 12 examples before the noun and 4 after, that is the same proportion as in Isidor. According to my statistics there are 40 examples in the Tatian of the genitive preceding the noun contrary to the Latin order. In view of the considerable discrepancy between my figures and Behaghel's, I give the complete list of the additional 28 examples: 13,2; 22,15; 25,6 (twice); 25,7; 42,1 (twice); 44,4; 47,7, 64,7, 64,10; 72,1; 74,1; 74,4; 90,3; 94,2; 94,2; 94,3; 100,6; 101,1 *himilo rihhi*; 12,3 *eines tages weg*; 21,12 *todes scuwen*; 44,10 *in tuomes tag*; 44,20 *wares houbits hār*; 51,2 *hmiles fugala*; 65,3,5 *in toumes tage*; 73,2 *hmiles fugala*. Examining now those examples which Behaghel quotes to prove that the genitive could follow the noun at this time, I find.

(i) 53,14 *in stat zehen burgo* = *in Decapolim*. This was quoted by Behaghel himself in § 1565 as an example of the 'Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder' and should therefore not be included. Moreover, I take *burgo* to be a partitive genitive dependent on *zehen* and the whole phrase *zehen burgo* in apposition to *stat*. It was also hardly possible to have the order *in zehen burgo stat*.

(ii) 60,10 *fon themo furisten thero samanunga* = *ab archisinagogo*. The German phrase is here clearly a translation of *princeps unus sinagogae*, which is found a few verses earlier in 60,1 and there translated by *ein heristo thero samanunga*. Behaghel himself gave this as the explanation of *fauramaþleis synagogais* in Luke viii, 41, 49 in the Gothic Bible. Moreover Behaghel there regarded *synagogais* in Gothic as a personal noun. Why should *samanunga* in O.H.G. be treated differently? The same phrase is found in Tatian, 60,11,12, which Behaghel does not include in his list.

(iii) 30,4 *ein har thes fahses* = *unum capillum*. This is a partitive genitive in which *ein* is strongly stressed. As Behaghel has shown in § 1565 any other order was very unusual when the noun *ein* preceded the governing noun.

(iv) 29,2 *uzan sahha huores* = *excepto fornicationis causa*¹.

This is a possible example of a genitive following the noun. The only other explanation would be that *uzan sahha* is a prepositional phrase as the same word is used in English and Norse. In 84,5 *sine causa* is also translated by *uzan sahha*.

Admitting the last example the proportion in the Tatian (pp. 1-150) of genitives before the noun to those after is 40 : 1. I have also investigated the remainder of the Tatian and not found any other examples of the genitive following. In the whole of the Tatian the proportion is

¹ This is quoted as 29,12 in Behaghel which is a misprint.

56 : 1. The proportion is certainly not 3 : 1 as Behaghel claims. In fact the genitive after the noun is practically unknown in earliest O.H.G., except when the Latin order is followed.

In examining Isidor and Tatian I have adopted Behaghel's method, as the number of genitives after the noun is so small that there is really no question of comparing the two positions. With Notker however where the genitive is frequently found after the noun, it is necessary to adopt a different method of counting the examples, although Behaghel continues with his method which leads him to inaccurate results. It will be remembered that the references quoted above contain two groups of genitives which show the possible order of words in German. Now it is obvious that in those examples where the Latin order is reversed in German the proportion of genitives preceding to those following the noun in German will be distorted by the proportion in Latin. The Tatian is the most striking example. In the Latin text the genitive almost exclusively follows the governing noun. In the first 150 pages I find only 4 examples of the Latin genitive of non-personal nouns before the governing noun. It follows then that there are only 4 possible examples of the reverse order in German, whilst the number of cases when the German genitive could precede the noun differing from Latin is large. The same applies, although not so clearly, to Isidor. I consider it therefore incorrect to include this group in calculating the proportion of the genitives preceding to those following in German, although they can be used as evidence for the possible order of words in German. As I have shown above there is no question of calculating any such proportion in the Tatian and Isidor, as the genitive is hardly ever found after the noun, and I have therefore used Behaghel's method there. In Notker however where it is desired to arrive at a correct proportion this group of genitives must be excluded and only the other group included, the cases where the translator uses a genitive where there is none in Latin. In these the influence of the Latin order is practically excluded and they give a true picture of the situation in German. How important this is, is seen if Behaghel's method is applied to parts of Notker which he has not examined¹. He finds that in the first 50 pages of Piper's edition of Boethius the proportion of genitives preceding to those following is 20 : 8². Applying Behaghel's

¹ Whilst admitting the difficulties in writing a complete history of German syntax, it must be pointed out that it is hardly sufficient to take 50 pages from an author whose work extends to over 1200 pages. In the Preface to the first volume of his *Deutsche Syntax* Behaghel defends this method of 'Stichproben', but if he had happened to take 50 pages from Marcianus Capella he would have arrived at different results.

² He gives 18 examples of the genitive preceding the noun and in the next sentence states that the proportion in Notker is 20 : 8. I am unable to follow this.

method to Marcianus Capella, this proportion is reversed. This does not mean that Notker's usage has changed but that the figures are distorted by the proportions in Latin. In Boethius the genitive usually follows, whilst in Marcianus Capella the opposite is the case. Had Behaghel considered this factor, he would have found that there are in the first 50 pages of Boethius only 7 examples of the Latin genitive of the non-personal noun preceding the governing noun, and therefore only 7 possible examples of the reverse order in German. Of these 7 Notker reverses the order four times. This alone suggests, what is proved by my statistics, namely that the genitive after the noun was as frequent as any other order in Notker. In the following statistics I only include therefore those examples where Notker uses a genitive where there is none in Latin and this method shows that there is no difference in the usage in the different parts of Notker's work.

Another limitation of the method is also necessary in Notker. As is well known, Notker gives a fairly free translation of the Latin text and adds a commentary. It is obvious that the order of words in the commentary may be considerably influenced by the Latin just as much as the translation. The extent of this influence could only be estimated by a comparison, sentence by sentence, of Notker's commentary with the Latin, and this is impossible as in some cases the Latin commentary is not extant and in others is unknown. That part of Notker's work which is a commentary must therefore be excluded in any attempt to arrive at the free German order of words in Notker and certainly cannot be taken in its entirety as Behaghel has done as evidence for the German order of words. In the following I only consider those parts of Notker's work where the translation can be easily compared with the original, namely the actual translation, not the commentary.

Behaghel finds that in the first 50 pages the personal nouns still precede. In fact there is only one exception. Again as a comparison between the two orders does not enter into the question I do not alter Behaghel's figures on the principles discussed above¹.

Turning now to the non-personal nouns, I give a complete list from the translations of Boethius, Marcianus Capella and Aristotle. I exclude the Psalms as Notker keeps there closely to the Latin order and the examples of a genitive where there is none in Latin are so few as to be negligible.

¹ He gives a list of 20 personal genitives preceding the noun, which contains 4 errors. 29,9 is a misprint for 26,9 and 27,11 for 27,21. He quotes one reference twice (26,23), which should not be included at all as the phrase has the Latin order, *tero lantluto quot = provincialium fortunas*.

Boethius (Piper, pp. 1-363).

(a) Genitives before the noun¹.

10,29 *segon stuofa*; 14,6 *dero sunnun verte*, 14,11 *anderro planetarum verte*; 17,7 *ougon leht*; 22,30 *tes muotes festi*; 118,15 *des lodes joche*; 139,2 *tes jungen boumes obenahtri*; 139,20 *in ringes wis*; 165,20 *dero bluomon sconi*; 208,27 *in ringes wis*; 209,8 *das sunnun leht*, 210,6 *des lichamen drucche*; 230,3 *dero planetarum furt*; 271,24 *wunderonnes ende*; 274,6 *for dissés puoches uzlaze*; 281,20 *sines muotes einfalt*; 291,31 *tero bluomon stang*, 330,7 *alles tinges kuussa starchunga*; 337,8 *muotes pildunga*.

(b) Genitives after the noun.

12,6 *mit suozemo etere vro worto*; 16,32 *mit kcsotenemo tuoche vro wate*; 34,20 *ze geuronedo mines kuotes*; 87,10 *grieze des stades*, 117,24 *demo charchare des lichamen*; 119,24 *der jungeste tag tero werlte*; 126,19 *diu strengen lâchen dinero redo*; 129,26 *diu missenomeni des weges*; 142,13 *ter scaz tero tugedo*; 164,5 *tien fromon dero selo*; 177,10 *nah temo ewigen bilde dines muotes*; 208,27 *lange ferte des muotes*; 229,29 *fone drati sinero ferti*; 270,3 *den nordkibel des himales*; 275,32 *dero ordeno des zites*; 276,15 *in samohaftero antwurti sines muotes*; 278,2 *tiu nahi des steftes*; 280,9 *tiu rihti des selben fati*; 281,2 *tiu selba rihti des fati*; 314,5 *vinstri dero naht*; 332,21 *wizzentheit neheines dinges*; 338,25 *mit tero chunste des sensus*; 340,23 *tru wizzentheit tes muotes*.

There are therefore in the Boethius 19 genitives before the noun and 23 after.

Aristotle.

(a) Genitives before the noun.

380,28 *dero accidentium namo*; 383,9 *allero dingo stollin*; 454,18 *des honangis suezi*; 454,18 *des zanderin heizi*; 554,30 *einis tingis accidentia*; 488,15 *sines wesennes keihle*; 619,3 *wistuomes flegerin*.

(b) Genitives after the noun.

400,5 *an dero maze dero syllabarum*; 411,2 *dia langseine des werches*; 457,5 *tisen qualitatibus des lichaman*; 459,5 *tie qualitates tero selo*; 460,8 *tie namen dero qualium*; 466,24 *fone dero habo dero specierum*; 470,1 *mit temo namin dero gagensihle*; 488,26 *machunga des tingis*; 501,15 *kelihnisse dero*

¹ Behaghel's list of 18 genitives preceding the noun from the first 50 pages contains two which should not be included as they have the Latin order: 5,5 *allero richo herren* = *rerum dominos*; 31,12 *tero briero undriwa* = *quarum frau*s. Various others are excluded on the principles already discussed.

gedancho; 502, 21 *ane dia bezeichennissida temporis*; 533, 18 *an dero widerchetungo dero oppositorum*.

Thus the proportion in Aristotle is 7 : 11.

Marcianus Capella.

(a) Genitives before the noun.

715, 20 *des meres sun*; 720, 4 *dero sunnun skimen*; 729, 20, 22 *dero planetarum ringo*; 731, 8 *mines houbites tohter*; 769, 7 *nah sunnun sedelgange*; 790, 2 *tero planetarum ferte*; 817, 1 *dero sunnun ringe*; 820, 20 *durstes laba*; 826, 21 *ter sunnun lampas*; 832, 10 *mit saligero selon lone*; 834, 32 *mit tages lehte*; 841, 2 *eina urspringes tiernun*.

(b) Genitives after the noun.

695, 9 *an der jarumbeverte des zodiaci*; 704, 25 *fone gehellemo anastoze des windes*; 735, 9 *after dero lengi des zodanci*; 746, 1 *diu wiha craft iro gotheite*; 750, 7 *an dren siten dero coronae*; 772, 5 *nah temo salbe des rangleiches*; 774, 19 *mit tero folleglichî des selben cubi*, 781, 30 *so gwissiu rarta dero numerorum*; 784, 4 *durh tra nuot tero turon*; 788, 31 *in dero lustsami dero wisun*; 789, 20 *tie zesamine haftenten ringe dero planetarum*; 793, 1 *die warba des sanges*; 795, 26 *ze lone dînero arbeito*; 796, 6 *anagenne dero listo*; 819, 9 *die fiurinen festina dero planetarum*; 827, 12 *ze dren uzswizzedon des touues*; 833, 14 *ouga dero werlte*.

The proportion therefore in this part of Notker's work is 13 : 17. In the whole of the texts I have examined the proportion is 39 : 51. It appears therefore that by the end of the O.H.G. period it was more usual for the non-personal genitive to follow the noun than to precede it, whilst at the beginning of the O.H.G. period and in Gothic this position was practically unknown. It is true that Behaghel was able to trace some progress from Isidor to Notker. His figures gave him Isidor 22 : 6 and Notker 20 : 8, which he calls 'einen erheblichen Fortschritt.' The difference between Isidor and Notker is however much more considerable than Behaghel supposes. In Isidor there are at the most two examples of the non-personal genitive following the governing noun whilst in Notker this position was more usual than any other.

In Willeram (ed. Seemüller) Behaghel finds that the personal nouns are still placed before the governing noun with one exception: 143, 2 *die menigî des lutes*. To this should be added another collective: 17, 5 *smidezierda dero cristenheite*. Behaghel however finds a striking difference between Notker and Willeram in the treatment of the non-personal genitive. Whereas in Notker the proportion of genitives before the noun

to those after was, according to Behaghel, 20:8, in Willeram this proportion is reversed, 7:13. Behaghel offers no explanation of this sudden change in the usage. Accepting for the moment Behaghel's figures for Willeram, it is clear that there is no considerable difference between Willeram and the position in Notker as described above. In Notker it was found that the genitive following the noun predominates over the reverse position and Willeram shows but a slight advance on Notker. This is a result which is more probable than Behaghel's sudden and unexplained reversal. Behaghel's account of Willeram requires however some modification. In addition to the 7 examples quoted by him of the genitive preceding the noun, I find the following three: 51,21 *des lichamen gluste*; 65,5 *der alten ewon asperitas*; 123,2 *epfelo stank*. As he does not quote his references for the 13 genitives following the noun, I am unable to tell on what principle he has arrived at this figure¹.

As explained above a comparison of the number of cases where the translator reverses the order of the Latin genitive and noun does not give a reliable picture of the position in German, because of the predominance of one particular position in Latin, and only those cases can be considered where the translator uses a genitive when there is none in Latin. Also it is again incorrect to include all the examples from the commentary as distinct from the paraphrase of the *Song of Songs*. In the case of Willeram however a comparison of the German with the sources of the commentary is possible, and is also necessary, as Willeram sometimes introduces phrases from the commentary into the actual paraphrase. As is well known, Willeram's source for the commentary was Haimo von Halberstadt's *Enarratio in Cantica Cantecorum* (quoted here from J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, vol. cxvii) together with Bede's *Expositio in Cantica Cantecorum* and various minor sources which are unimportant for our purpose. An examination of the commentary shows that Willeram normally follows the Latin order of genitive and noun. I quote a few examples in proof of this.

W 78,9 *mit wirdigero riwon zaheren* = Haimo 328 *dignis poenitentiae fletibus*. This therefore should not have been included by Behaghel in his list of genitives before the noun. W 7,4 *diu austeritas der ewo* = Haimo 295 *austeritatem legis*. W 17 *die toigene dero gescrifte* = Haimo 299 *secreta Scripturarum*; W 57,7 *dero rote mines bluotes* = Haimo 316 *rubor sanguinis*; W 76,5 *die oigen mines herzen* = Haimo 327 *oculos cordis mei*. The order of words in the commentary in a few cases influences Willeram's

¹ For the genitives following the noun Behaghel refers to a work by Wagner, the title and publisher of which he does not state here.

paraphrase of the *Song of Songs*: W 138,1 *der minnon liehtvas* = Vulgate *lampades* = Haimo 354 *dilectionis lampades*; W 52,5 *daz mittelode des diskes* = Vulgate *media* = Haimo 313 *media huius ferculi*.

Including then only those cases from the paraphrase and the commentary, where there is no genitive in the Latin, I find:

Genitives before the noun: W 51,21 *des lichenen gluste*; 69,5 *dero tugede allero anagenge*; 52,23 *dirro werlt arbeite*. (Seemuller takes this last example as a compound.)

Genitives after the noun: 56,7 *die menigi dero lokko*; 74,15 *der wabo des seimes*; 85,7 *von urdrieze dirro werlte*; 112,11 *von der gebo minero hente*; 139,5 *daz ernost miner minnon*; 139,6 *von der statekeite des geloben*.

There are therefore 3 genitives before the noun and 6 after. These figures are too slight to allow any safe conclusions to be drawn, but they do not show any sudden break with the usage in Notker's works.

Behaghel continues his account of the genitive to Modern German and finds for the first time in Albrecht von Eyb a clear distinction between the proper personal nouns and the common personal nouns (appellatives). The former are still normally placed before the noun as in Modern German, whilst the latter are tending to follow like the non-personal genitives. But on coming to Luther, Behaghel finds that this distinction is abandoned. In the parts of von Eyb and Luther, which he has examined, he finds the following proportions:

| | von Eyb | Luther |
|--------------|---------|---------|
| Proper nouns | 9 : 3 | 17 : 20 |
| Appellatives | 9 : 19 | 18 : 8 |

Behaghel rightly considers this a strange conclusion. In the first place Luther's treatment of the proper nouns is different from all other authors from the earliest times to Modern German, where the majority of the proper nouns still precede the governing noun and, secondly, whilst placing the majority of the proper nouns after the governing noun, he still keeps the appellatives in front, again differing from the general usage. Behaghel's account of the usage in Luther is however incorrect. It is again his method of 'Stichproben' which leads him astray. He takes his examples for Luther from Clemen's edition of Luther's works, vol. III, pp. 317-63 (*Ob Kriegsleute auch in seligem Stande seyn können* and a part of *Vom Abendmahl Christi*) and also from the first ten chapters of the *Buch der Makkabäer*. Now the Bible is obviously an unsuitable text to choose for an account of the order of words in a particular author, for the order, especially of the proper nouns, is here traditional and fixed, just as it is in Modern German. In the Bible Luther follows the traditional order

of the Vulgate where the genitives follow the noun and his usage in this text is quite different from that of his other works. The Bible therefore cannot be used for an account of the free order of words in German. Even taking the small fragment of Luther's works which Behaghel has quoted, there is a clear difference between the usage in the Bible and the other texts. The proportions are Bible 12 : 17 compared with 5 : 2 in the other texts, which Behaghel has examined¹.

I have examined the following texts from Clemen's edition of Luther: *An den Christlichen Adel; Von den guten Werken; Sendbrief vom Domeschen; Wider Hans Worst; Eine Predigt, dass man Kinder zur Schule halten solle; Vermahnung an die Geistlichen zu Augsburg* and the sections from Clemen's edition, vol. III, quoted by Behaghel, and I find that the proportion of proper nouns before the governing noun to those following is 132 : 44².

It is clear then that there is no difference in the treatment of the proper nouns between von Eyb and Luther and that Luther does not stand aside from the general line of development in early Modern German.

An examination of the 42 proper nouns which follow the noun shows that Luther makes certain distinctions which Behaghel has failed to observe. Practically all of them fall into two well defined classes.

(a) 20 out of the 44 are words, which although treated as proper nouns share the character of appellatives. These are normally placed after the noun in Modern German and it appears therefore that the distinction between them and the real proper nouns had already begun in Luther's time although the majority of them still appear before the noun. The following are the references: *An den Chr. Adel*: 372, 14 *der Bepst*; 382, 30, 387, 38, 390, 17, 391, 37, 410, 40 *des Bapsts*; 374, 30 *regiment der Römer*. *Von den guten Werken*: 290, 30 *unter allen streyten der Christen*. *Sendbrief*: no examples. *Wider Hans Worst*: 327, 19, 340, 24, 346, 14 *des Bapsts*; 334, 30, 335, 32, 352, 12 *des Teufels*; 376, 30 *des Keisers*. *Predigt*: 164, 35, 165, 28 *des Keisers*. *Ob Kriegsleute etc.*: 342, 23, 333, 5 *des Keisers*. *Vermahnung*: 128, 18 *des Endechrists*.

(b) 23 out of the 44 examples are words which have a Latin inflection or are Hebrew names which are often left without ending as in the Vulgate. The list is as follows: *An den Chr. Adel*: 365, 26 *die kinder beniamin*; 371, 39 *das wort Pauli*; 412, 30 *das buch Machabeorum*; 412, 34

¹ He again states that the proportion is 17 : 20 and only quotes 19 references to the genitive following. As a matter of fact, neither figure is correct, as is shown later.

² It is of course impossible to draw a strict distinction between proper personal nouns and appellatives. I follow Behaghel in including under proper nouns words such as *Teufel, Papst, Kaiser, König* as well as names of nations and parties. I exclude from these statistics *Gott* and *Christus* which are dealt with separately by Behaghel.

die bucher Aristoteles. Von den guten Werken: 234,7 im gesetz Mosi; 254,10, 273,29,33 taffel Mosi; 246,19 der Spruch Salamonis; 268,36 in den buchern Mosi. Sendbrief: 180,10 im text Pauli; 181,9 die ersten zwey wort Matthar. Wider Hans Worst: 342,35 dem Son Constantini; 345,31 das gantze Gesetze Mosi. Predigt: 159,30 die priester Levi; 159,32 dem stam Levi; 160,4 das gantze geschlecht Levi; 161,28 der lere Jeremie; 174,39 zur zeit Mose. Vermahnung: 128,15 die weissagung Danielis. Ob Kriegsleute etc.: 324,39 das hertz Juda; 325,1 das hertz Petri, 361,37 nach der lere Horati¹.

There is only 1 example which does not fall into one of the above two classes, namely, *Vermahnung*, 121,3 *aus der neuen lere des Luthers*, which is placed in inverted commas as being a quotation from someone else. From this it appears that there are practically no examples of a genuine German proper noun following the governing noun in Luther and further that the placing of the proper noun after the governing noun in German is due to Latin influence. Hence the predominance of this order in the Biblical passages which Behaghel examined. This too explains the order of *Christus*. As Behaghel points out the genitive *Christus* normally precedes the noun. To this should be added that *Christi* normally follows. The Latin influence is also clearly seen in such pairs as *das wort Pauli* but *Paulus wort* or *das gesetz Mosi* but *Moses gesetz*².

In this respect Luther is no different from his contemporaries and it is important to note that those 'Volksbücher' in which the Latin declension of the proper nouns is not found, also have no genitives of the proper noun following the governing noun. My remarks on the position of such words as *Papst*, *Teufel*, *Kaiser*, etc. are also borne out by an examination of the usage in other writers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. For example:

Trojas Zerstörung (Volksbücher vom sterbenden Rittertum). 12 genitives before the noun, 3 after. The three following are 9,17, 10,16 *Jasonis*; 13,18 *in der Ere Jovis*—all three in the titles of chapters.

Hug Schapler (Volksbücher vom sterbenden Rittertum, pp. 23-69). The ratio is 55 : 1. The one example is in a title 45,31 *Bystant der Künigin*.

Pontus und Sidonia (Volksbücher vom sterbenden Rittertum, pp. 114-70). The ratio is 55 : 4, the 4 examples are 116,3, 123,4 *den Glauben des Machametes*; 145,7 *Zukunft Pontus*; 132,15 *den Glauben Machametes*.

¹ Behaghel's figures for Clemen, pp. 317-63, should be altered from 5 : 2 to 10 : 3. He has omitted 345,20 *Gedeonis schwerdt*; 324,37 *mit Annas diener*; 325,7 *aus Davids befelh*; 335,36, 355,22 *des Teuffels*, and of the genitives following 361,37 *nach der lere Horatii*.

² This does not mean that the Latin genitive does not precede the noun at this time. It often does but the point is that the German genitive does not follow the noun.

Eulenspiegel (Neudrucke, pp. 1-50). The ratio is 12 : 0.

Faust (Neudrucke). The ratio is 16 : 18. The number of genitives following is here larger because of the frequent occurrence of the word *Teufel*: pp. 10 (twice), 29, 32 (three times), 38, 60, 101, 114, 120; also 61 *des Bapsts*; 68 *enes Bapsts*; 62 *des Keyzers*, 76 *aller Keyser*; 6 *alle Sunde Sauls*; 15 *mit der Epistel Pauli*; 18 *Fausti*. There is therefore here one example of a proper noun with German declension following but it is a Biblical name (*Sauls*).

Murner, *An den grossmächtigsten und durchlauchtigsten Adel deutscher Nation* (Neudrucke, p. 153). The ratio is 8 : 4. All the 4 examples are of the same type as Luther's: 24 *das buoch der leviten*; 30 *nach dem gesetz Moysi*; 32 *in den büchern Moysi*; 49 *die wunderwerk der Teufel*.

Hutten, *Opera* (ed. Böcking), vol. iv, pp. 603-79. The ratio is 33 : 9. The 9 examples are the same as the two classes in Luther: 606, 10 *die . . . helss der Teutschen*; 610, 34 *nach der ermanung Esaie*; 611, 18 *wort und werck Petri*; 613, 630, 3 *des Bapsts*; 614, 30 *alle bieberey und finantz der Romanorum*; 656, 19 *die selbigen wort Pauli*; 658, 11 *ler der teuffel*; 659, 40 *der ler Pauli*.

Zwingli, extracts contained in Wackernagel, *Proben der deutschen Prosa* (vol. i). The ratio is 5 : 7. Despite the different ratio the theory discussed above is not affected. The examples of the genitive following are all Latin: *Pauli* follows 242, 39, 244, 24, 245, 14, 249, 26, 249, 30, 249, 40, and 239, 1 *zuon zyten Ezechielis*.

S. Franck, extracts from Wackernagel, *loc. cit.*, the ratio is 6 : 4. The examples for the genitive following are: 321, 39 *bündnissen des teufels*; 337, 21 *das fest Saturni*; 377, 7 *das gesetz Moisi*. There is also one example of a German genitive following, but this is a Biblical name: 355, 16 *Schlüssel Davids*.

Berthold, *Deutsche Theologie* (extracts from Wackernagel, *loc. cit.*). The ratio is 10 : 4 and the 4 examples are 274, 2 *weissagung Pauli*; 278, 1, 6 *das gesetz Moisi* and 290, 29 *der stat des dewfels*.

The conclusions which were drawn from Luther are therefore borne out by the other writers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The real proper nouns are only placed after the governing noun under Latin influence and there is no difference between Luther's usage and that of any other writer of his time whom I have investigated.

Also, according to Behaghel, Luther is different from von Eyb, in that the distinction between proper nouns and appellatives is not observed in Luther. From my revised figures it is apparent that Luther did make a difference between these two classes of nouns. The ratio for the proper

nouns is in Luther 132 : 44, for the appellatives 81 : 54 and as shown above the 44 proper nouns placed after the noun were practically all of two types. Moreover, it cannot be claimed that von Eyb is characteristic of the period in this respect. I give below the percentage of appellatives placed after the noun from the texts quoted above:

| | % | | % |
|---------|----|---------------------------|----|
| von Eyb | 68 | <i>Pontus und Sidonia</i> | 39 |
| Zwingli | 68 | <i>Trojas Zerstorung</i> | 32 |
| Murner | 57 | Franck | 30 |
| Faust | 58 | Berthold | 29 |
| Hutten | 52 | <i>Eulenspiegel</i> | 13 |
| Luther | 40 | <i>Hug Schapler</i> | 0 |

From this it appears that there was considerable difference in the usage in this period, but it cannot be said that the figures for Luther are 'ein auffallendes Ergebnis,' as Behaghel claims.

CHARLES T. CARR.

ST ANDREWS.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

THE FINN 'EPISODE' IN 'BEOWULF.'

After making an able survey and criticism of Bugge's reconstruction of the events of the Finn story, involving the identity of 'Eotens' and Frisians and a treacherous attack made by Finn on his brother-in-law the Danish prince Hnæf, Professor R. W. Chambers advances the suggestion that the 'Eotens' were Jutes and that the cause of all the woe was an attack made on Hnæf by the Jutes in the service of Finn, in which the king's son joined, and that Finn came into the fight after his sons were killed. In his concluding remarks¹ Dr Chambers says that this is the only theory yet put forward which explains the known facts of the case. There are, however, in our view one or two points in the 'episode' which have been either unnoticed or insufficiently stressed, and if these are given their due weight we must hold with Bugge in his contention that 'Eotens' and Frisians are one and the same people. In Bugge's other contention, viz., that Finn was the treacherous aggressor, we find ourselves in disagreement, and so far in agreement with Professor Chambers.

First, with regard to the 'Eotens.' If a treacherous attack was made on Hnæf and his Danes by Jutes in Finn's service, as Dr Chambers maintains, how is it that none of the Jutish leaders is mentioned by name? Again, evidence of the identity of Frisians and 'Eotens' *in the poet's mind* is afforded by the terms of the pact proposed by Finn to Hengest. In *Beowulf*, ll. 1086-8, we learn that *another* hall, containing a high-seat, was prepared for the Danes, who are to have 'joint use of it vis-à-vis the sons of the Eotens.' Further, Finn solemnly binds himself to give the Danes every day the same amount of treasure that he gives his own Frisians in the beer-hall.

Is it likely that Finn would have offered Hengest and his followers a hall to be shared equally with the hated Jutes, their treacherous assailants, according to Professor Chambers? Hardly, we think. The joint tenure of the new hall is surely a co-tenure with Finn, and is, like the joint participation in the royal bounty, a device to 'save the face' of the Danes and make it less difficult for them to accept the terms offered them by their lord's slayer. Finn, then, is to hold *two* courts every day, one with his own Frisians in their hall, the other with the Danes in *their*

¹ *Beowulf*, p. 287.

hall, where he will sit on the *heasetl*, the *bregostol*, there expressly reserved for him. In ll. 1098-9 it is said that Finn is to 'maintain the Danes with honours,' i.e., confirm them in their privileges, 'by the vote of his privy council.' Nothing could be more calculated to soothe the wounded feelings of Hengest and his *wealaf*, whose position is thus regularised and as it were embodied in the constitution of Finn's state. Finally, to complete the offer and give it a sanction which would more than anything else reassure the Danes, Finn swears that any of the *Frisians* who shall taunt the Danes with taking service with their lord's slayer shall be put to death. Why 'Frisians'? Surely, if the treacherous aggressors had been Jutes, here if anywhere was the place to mention them by name. The foregoing considerations, together with the final Danish attack on Finn resulting in his death, convince us that the Frisian king and his people were the objects of Danish hatred and that 'Eotens' is merely another name for Frisians. True, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the words *eotena*, *eotenum* are, as Dr Chambers maintains, due to the copyist's misunderstanding of the Northumbrian *Eōtna*, *Eōt(n)um*, 'Jutes,' since no other name has so far been suggested as the original of *eotena*, *eotenum*, and we cannot bring ourselves to admit that *eotenas*, 'giants,' is used as a nickname of the Frisians. But, is there not a possibility that the poet, living at the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century, may have regarded the names 'Frisians' and 'Jutes' as synonyms for Finn's subjects? Our poet may not have been so well up in Germanic geography, history and ethnography as the modern scholar!

Professor Chambers' chief reason for regarding Jutish followers of Finn as the treacherous aggressors is his laudable desire to free the Frisian king from the charge of perfidy towards his guests. But he has overlooked the implications of a line in the 'Episode' which in our opinion provides the key to the problem. This line runs *Finnes eaferum, þa hve se fær begeat*, l. 1068. As Klaeber notes, the clause *þa hve se fær begeat* marks the end of a statement as in *þa hve se fær begeat*, l. 2230. If this is so, we are forced to conclude that the opening words of the story related by Hrothgar's minstrel have been omitted by the careless scribe. Such a sentence may have been *Hwæt, þæm æðelum wæs ende gegongen*, or something equivalent. Now *fær* means 'sudden attack'; who then would make an attack on Finn's sons, if not their uncle Hnæf? Why did he attack his nephews? The answer lies, we think, in ll. 1071-2, 'Hildeburh had no reason to praise the faith of the Eotens,' in other words, Finn's sons had angered Hnæf by some act, perhaps the killing of one

or more Danes. We have now in the facts of the 'Episode' and the *Fornsburg Fragment* sufficient material for a fresh reconstruction, differing somewhat from that proposed by Bugge. First we must try to fill in the blank between the attack by Hnæf on Finn's sons and the Frisian king's fruitless efforts to overcome Hengest and his *wealaf*, as recorded in ll. 1082-5. We suggest that when Finn's sons fell in the attack made upon them by Hnæf, Finn, who was at the time absent from his hall, on hearing the news came back in haste and attacked Hnæf and his Danes, who had barricaded themselves in the hall. In the *Fragment* Hnæf is in the hall encouraging his men, and it is probable that in the remaining portion of the poem, now lost, his death at Finn's hands was narrated. As Finn was unable to enter the hall we may assume that Hnæf was killed during a sortie made by the Danes, or else, exposing himself too confidently, he may have been slain by a spear hurled by Finn. The Danish prince must have sold his life dearly, however, as he is said to have fallen 'among Frisian dead,' ll. 1069-70, and many Frisians must have perished in the earlier attack on Finn's sons, so that the poet might well remark that 'war destroyed all Finn's thanes save a few only,' ll. 1080-1. We must however always bear in mind that the authors of the longer and the shorter poem may not have followed quite the same version of the story, especially if, as is probable, they were separated by a considerable interval of time.

Though the Frisian king in slaying Hnæf was obeying the dictates of both honour and parental affection, the greater body of the Danish people, apart from thethane Hengest and his little band, could only think of him as the slayer of their prince¹ and were bound to exact the ultimate penalty.

W. J. SEDGEFIELD.

MANCHESTER.

THE MYSTERY OF 'THE STAGE COACH.'

The prologue to *The Stage Coach*, which purports to have been spoken at a revival for the author's benefit, presents many interesting problems,

¹ He may have been *their king*, successor to his father Hoc, in which case Finn may well have been on a visit to his royal brother-in-law, occupying with his family and suite a hall specially reserved for him in the Halfdanes' *heaburg*. A brawl by Finn's sons and their retinue resulting in the death of some Danes, followed by summary punishment by Hnæf and lastly by a great fight between royal host and royal guest would be events long to be remembered in story. If this theory is correct, we must assume that the provisions of the pact between Finn and Hengest were to come into force, not at once in Hnæf's *heaburg*, but when Finn should have returned home to Frisia with his retinue and Hengest's band. Their return would follow immediately on the acceptance of the treaty by Hengest.

but I do not think that Dr W. J. Lawrence is correct in his argument¹ that it was spoken for the benefit of the author of the alteration, that is, William Rufus Chetwood, who made it into a ballad opera. About 1930 Mr Charles Stonehill in his Nonesuch edition of Farquhar's works reprints it from Thomas Wilkes's Dublin edition of 1775. But both prologue and epilogue were printed in 1728, in an edition of *The Stage Coach* by George Risk of Dublin. The title-page of this edition reads: 'The / Stage-Coach. / A / Comedy. / As it is Acted at the / Theatres. / By Mr. George Farquar. / To which is prefix'd / The Life and Character of / Mr George Farquar: With a Song on a / Trifle. / Dublin: / Printed by S. Powell, for George Risk, / at Shakespear's-head, the corner of Castle- / lane, in Dame's-street, MDCCXXVIII.' / The headings are: *Prologue*. Spoken upon the Revival of this Comedy, at the Theatre in Lincolns-Inn-Fields, some years since, when acted for the Benefit of Author. Written by Mr Samuel Philips. *Epilogue*. Spoken by Captain Basil. Written by Mr Philips. The only song in this edition is *The Stage-Coach*, except for the 'Song on a Trifle,' which is prefixed to the farce, and does not form part of it.

The prologue shows that the revival of *The Stage Coach* at Lincoln's Inn Fields was given at a period when the drama was playing to empty houses:

To poor Monimia you unprty'd, mourn'd,
Her moving sighs, alas! were all return'd,
By a more piercing, echoing, hollow sound...

or, in plain English, after they had 'ransack'd the Globe to find out new' pieces, even a revival of *The Orphan* had failed. A later passage suggests that *The Stage Coach* was then revived as the fore-piece, and not the after-piece, to some new play:

We here this night present you
With something new, which will, we hope, content you....

This would not make sense unless it preceded the new play. Nevertheless, it is very puzzling. An author's benefit was not usually given on the first night of a new play, but the third:

To-Night, at least, let's your Compassion share,
And out of Charity be pleas'd to spare
The half-starv'd Poet, tho' you damn the Player.

I do not take this phrase quite so seriously as Dr Lawrence, for it all depends how the speaker delivered such stock-jokes on starving dramatists. The prologue also speaks of the theatre being deserted for 'a Rival,' which implies either opera or ballet. But the sum total is that

¹ See *The Mystery of 'The Stage Coach,' Mod. Lang. Rev.* xxvii, October, 1932, pp. 392 ff.

both prologue and epilogue were printed in 1728 as having been written 'some years since,' further than which I do not wish to speculate, beyond a suggestion that the year was probably 1703-4, when the theatre was very much under the weather.

Dr Lawrence dates the original performance of *The Stage Coach* as previous to March 1702, from an allusion to it in Motteux's prologue to *The Inconstant*, then first acted:

Farce is the Hasty Pudding of the Stage
For when you're treated with indifferent Cheer,
Ye can dispense with slender Stage-Coach fare.

He may be right, but, with all diffidence, I would add that 'Stage-Coach fare' was a perfectly understandable expression by itself. It was the custom to take meals at inns while stage-coaches were changing horses, and it was frequently alleged that inn-keepers bribed the hostlers and coachmen to be as quick as possible, so the guests would get very little to eat. This may merely mean that the allusion was double-edged. Of *The Inconstant* Baker wrote in his *Companion to the Playhouse*: 'The failure of the last-mentioned piece was entirely owing to the Inundation of Foreign Entertainments of Music, Singing, Dancing &c. which at that time broke in upon the English Stage in a torrent...and occasioned a total neglect of the more valuable and intrinsic Productions of our own countrymen.'

This copy of *The Stage Coach* sports on the title-page the most villainous vignette of Shakespear's Head I have ever seen: it is copied from Tonson's, and is much worse than Walker's. In the same volume are *The Twin Rivals*, Rhames, Dublin. 1726; *The Recruiting Officer*. S. Powell for Richard Norris, Dublin. 1727; *The Beaux' Stratagem* The Eleventh Edition. S. Powell for William Smith, Dublin. 1729 and *The Inconstant*, without title-page.

R. CROMPTON RHODES.

MOSELEY.

ROBIN HOOD.

The earliest known reference to Robin Hood appears to be in the B-text of *Piers Plowman*, passus v, l. 402 (A.D. 1377), where Sloth says that 'I can nougte perfitly my paternoster as pe prest it syngeth, But I can rymes of Robyn hood,' etc. But this allusion may perhaps be considerably antedated by a reference in the Monk Bretton Cartulary (Yorkshire Archæological Society, Record Series, vol. LXVI) to 'the stone of *Robin Hode*' in a document of 1322. The stone was in what is now

Skelbrooke township in the West Riding of Yorkshire, and its site probably corresponds with that of the present-day Robin Hood's Well which is on the Great North Road in the same township (1 in. Ordnance Survey map 38 A 4) about $6\frac{3}{4}$ miles north-west of Doncaster and about a mile south of Barnsdale (1 in. Ordnance map 32 J 4)—the *Barnysdale* of the Ballads and Wyntoun's Chronicle (c. 1420), also mentioned independently of the Robin Hood stories as *Barnysdale* in 1468 in the Monk Bretton Cartulary. At the moment the earliest reference to Robin Hood's Well is the sixteenth-century *Robinhood-well* in Dodsworth's Notes (printed in the *Yorkshire Archæological Journal*, XIII, p. 111), but that is old enough to show that the name is not a modern invention, and this, with the topography, would be enough to associate the older place-name with the Robin Hood of the ballads and not with some otherwise unknown individual who chanced to bear the famous name.

A. H. SMITH.

LONDON.

THE LOCALISATION OF BODL. MS. 34.

The localisation of the early thirteenth-century Bodl. MS. 34 has become one of the most important questions of early Middle English scholarship, for Professor Tolkien has shown¹ the peculiar virtues of this text linguistically, and raised most interesting problems by pointing out that its language is identical with that of the version of the *Ancren Riwele* found in Corpus Christi Coll. Camb. MS. 402 (a revised text, adapted to the use of twenty recluses instead of the original three, here given the distinctive title *Ancrene Wisse*).

Professor Tolkien believes that the language of the Bodl. and Corpus MSS. just mentioned is 'an actual dialect' rather than a 'standard language based on one'.² Though he does not decide positively on the localisation of these two basically important texts, he says that it is, 'to say no more, highly suggestive' that both are 'definitely connected with Herefordshire.' 'It is certainly odd,' he goes on, 'that two manuscripts, which at the very least have every appearance of being closely connected in place of origin, should both have wandered to that somewhat remote county in the fourteenth century, if they did not originally belong there'.³

I shall discuss the localisation of *Ancrene Wisse*, along with that of the other manuscripts of the *Ancren Riwele*, in an article under prepara-

¹ 'Ancrene Wisse and Hali Meððad,' *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, XIV, pp. 104-26.

² *Ibid.*, p. 106 f.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

tion. I wish to point out here that the localisation of Bodl. 34 in Herefordshire in the fourteenth century rests on a palaeographical error.

When last autumn I examined Bodl. MS. 34¹ it was at once evident that some error must have crept in, in regard to the dating of the *marginalia* which give the only sign of provenance found in the volume. The notes in question are rude scribbles by persons from Hereford villages (Ledbury, Tedestone², Much Cowarne), of an obviously sixteenth-century character. Several give scraps of indentures in English of a very late type: a regnal year on f. 52 is probably Elizabethan. 'Yeoman' is the designation found with one example in one series of names (ff. 39, 44 v., 53 v.); it is likely that most if not all the scribblers came from the yeoman class. The name 'Thomas Clinton clericus' occurs once (f. 64 v.). The handwriting is extremely difficult for anyone not accustomed to reading sixteenth-century hands³.

The ascription of the Herefordshire notes to the fourteenth century accepted by Professor Tolkien and, earlier, by Dr Hall⁴, must have its origin in the hand-written catalogue of Bodleian MSS. accessible to readers in Duke Humfrey's Library, where they are so dated—it must be by an oversight. In the printed *Summary Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts of the Bodleian*, partly founded on the more copious hand-written descriptions, they are ascribed to the fifteenth century—which is also difficult to accept. I asked Dr Craster, Bodley's Librarian, for an authoritative dating, and at his request Mr Lobel, Keeper of Western MSS., kindly went over all the *marginalia* with me in detail. He dated them all 'in the course of the sixteenth century,' and thought some were Elizabethan.

Probably the notes of provenance on Bodl. MS. 34 all come from humble owners at the time of the Reformation or later. In any case they follow the original writing of the book by three hundred years.

In conclusion let me refer back to Professor Tolkien's reference to Herefordshire as a 'somewhat remote county' and suggest that through the first century and more after the two manuscripts in question were written it must, on the contrary, have been a social, political, and military centre, for this was the period of the Welsh wars, and of the rebellion of Simon de Montfort, which was fought to a conclusion on the Welsh border. That portion of the border connected with the two manuscripts

¹ When working with the aid of a grant from the American Council of Learned Societies.

² Read by Dr Joseph Hall as 'Godstow' (*Early Middle English*, Oxford, 1920, II, p. 492).

³ I have quoted the readings from the hand-written catalogue (sometimes corrected from the printed one).

⁴ *Loc. cit.*

was, moreover, the principal seat of the great family of Mortimer, of whom it has been said at about 1300: 'At this point the History of the House of Mortimer passes from the scope of a merely provincial record and becomes a feature in the annals of a nation¹.' I venture to think that at this period there is no part of England where there was more going and coming than in Herefordshire. Therefore I think it would be a great service to scholarship if the curiously correct language of Bodl. MS. 34 could be approached, for its localisation, through its linguistic evidence alone. It is to my mind impossible to say where a manuscript was copied of which we know nothing of the whereabouts till we find it in Herefordshire in the sixteenth century.

Nor will the localisation of *Ancrene Wisse*, which reached Wigmore Abbey about 1300 (about seventy years after its transcription), help us very much in localising the sister volume Bodl. 34. Wigmore Abbey was the religious home, so to speak, of the Mortimers, who founded it and had their principal seat at Wigmore Castle, where magnates from all over the kingdom congregated. I shall show, in a subsequent paper on the provenance of the manuscripts of the *Ancren Riwle*, that *Ancrene Wisse* is likely to have come to Wigmore from Shropshire. Moreover, I shall show a reason why, during the thirteenth and early fourteenth century, volumes treating the contemplative life of women might be expected to flow—even more than other books—into the country of the Welsh border.

The extant copies of the 'Katherine Group' and the earliest texts of the *Ancren Riwle* coincide, in date of handwriting, with an important recorded movement in religious history, when women of the highest Court connexions embraced the life of an anchoress. In this movement, women from the great West Country families bore a very important part. It is to my mind very likely that already in the thirteenth century the volumes in question were in the west, but the extant traces of their provenance are not significant enough to prove their origin. The burden of proof for the localisation of Bodl. 34 and *Ancrene Wisse* must, in my opinion, be thrown on the linguistic scholar to solve practically single-handed from what he knows of the localisation of the early Middle English language from other sources.

HOPE EMILY ALLEN.

KENWOOD, ONEIDA, NEW YORK.

¹ R. W. Eyton, *Antiquities of Shropshire*, London, 1856, iv, p. 217. Quoted, *D.N.B.* (art. 'Roger Mortimer (II)').

THE DIALECT OF THE 'SPIEGELBUCH.'

In a recent article¹ Dr Johannes Bolte returns to the subject of the *Spiegelbuch* and repeats the statement that the St Gall manuscript (F) is the oldest and best². He also refers to the dialect of T2, the lost Trier manuscript which has come to light again: 'Die sprachliche Form des Textes ist rheinfränkisch wie in den Handschriften G H T1.' Now the dialect of the *Spiegelbuch* is a matter of some importance from the point of view of textual criticism and also because of the light it may throw on the origin of the miniatures.

As regards H, the statement is correct, though it might be as well to add that *pf* and *ph* occur where we should expect *p* (*pf*ile, *ph*ule, *tröpf*lin, *tröpf*). This is probably due to the influence of the *Kanzleisprache*³. But none of the other manuscripts mentioned is in a pure dialect. T2 is written in a mixture of Rhenish and Middle Franconian. The Rhenish Franconian forms are held in common with H. I refer to such forms as *zyt*, *gybt*, *daz*, *lyp* (*Leib*), *uber*, *belabet*, *es*. The following peculiarities in the manuscript are typical of Middle Franconian: (i) in the orthography: the use of *i* and *e* after a long vowel, e.g. *groiss*, *laiss*, *doit*, *leir*, *meir*, *saele*; (ii) in the phonology: unshifted *t* in *dat*; unshifted *ff* in *lieff*, *liiff*, *bedroiffenisse* (*Betrubnis*), *dieff* (*Dieb*); unshifted *d* in *huden* (*hüten*), *bede*, *bereiden*, *dage*, *dun*, *drincken*, *gude*, *ydel*, *behalden*; *e* for *ie* in *spegel*, *zehen*, *flehen*; *a* for *o* in *wanen*, *van*, *sal*, *warl*, *ader*, *u* for *o* in *sulchen*, retention of *qu*; the contractions *hoer* (*höher*), *geschien* (*geschehen*); loss of *h* in *bevelen*; assimilation of *w* to *s* in *wiesset* (*wächst*); (iii) in the accent: the abbreviated declension of *unser* (*unsen*, *unes*, etc.); *-es*, in the second singular of verbs for *-est*; (iv) in the syntax: the use of the strong adjective in the gen. sing. fem. instead of the weak adjective; (v) in the vocabulary: *leren* instead of *lernen*.

Some of these features are not unknown in other dialects, e.g., in Hessian, but forms like *dat* and the peculiarity mentioned above in No. (iv) are only found in Middle Franconian, while the use of *or* in *bedroiffenisse* and in the hybrid *roiffen* (for *ropen*, *rufen*) is characteristic of North Middle Franconian or Ripuarian. The principal town in the Ripuarian area is Cologne and the Middle Franconian element in T2 bears a close resemblance to the language of a German translation of the

¹ *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin, 1932, xxvi, pp. 729-32.

² *Vide Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxviii, pp. 87-92.

³ Demeter, *Die Kurmainzer Kanzleisprache*, pp. 94-5 (Berlin Dissertation, 1916).

Pèlerinage de la vie humaine made at Cologne in 1444 (*Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters*, xxv).

A collation of H and T2 shows that the rhymes of both manuscripts are Rhenish Franconian in character, and that the scribe of T2 contents himself with giving a Middle Franconian character to the words he transcribes. He rarely makes any alterations of importance, unlike the scribe of F, who remodels whole couplets in order to get rid of Rhenish Franconian rhymes and substitutes Alemannic forms.

If we now turn to G (the Gotha text)¹, we see the same mixture of dialects as in T2. The Middle Franconian element is as much in evidence as in T2, but the substratum is Rhenish Franconian. G is not derived from T2, because it does not share readings peculiar to the former. It is closer to H. T1 (printed by Rieger in *Germania*, xvi) is a later manuscript than those we have been discussing and is of little use for the reconstruction of the text, as it is very corrupt. It is also written in Rhenish Franconian mixed with Middle Franconian. There are side by side forms like *bliven* and *triben*, *gottes* and *godes*. The complete absence of *dat* is doubtless due to the influence of the *Kanzleisprache*.

Dr Bolte draws attention to one important feature of F and Z: they omit coarse passages or tone them down. In the case of F the reason is not far to seek. The manuscript was copied in the neighbourhood of Freiburg² for the use of the local Clarisses or Franciscan nuns and it is connected with the reforms instituted by the Prioress, Magdalene Beutler, in 1450. Some phrases were not considered suitable for the eyes of nuns. One thing is certain: F is neither the oldest nor the best manuscript, and the original did not come from South-west Germany.

J. M. CLARK.

GLASGOW.

FONTANE'S POEM: 'WALTER SCOTT IN WESTMINSTER-ABTEI.'

Theodor Fontane, one of the many German admirers of Sir Walter Scott, wrote the above poem to describe an incident supposed to have taken place at the coronation of George IV in Westminster Abbey on July 19, 1821. In the course of the poem the following lines appear:

Wer aber die zwei, die da sich nahn?
Sie hoffen auf Zutritt, auf Gunst und Gluck;
Umsonst, Kommandoruf: 'Zuruck!'

¹ I should like to acknowledge here my indebtedness to the Trustees of the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland, who defrayed the expense of photographing the manuscript, and to Dr Pick, Director of the Herzogliche Bibliothek, Gotha, for much valuable assistance and information.

² This is shown *inter alia* by the prevalence of *ô* for M.H.G. *â*, forms like *dört*, *dorffest*, *sollend*, etc.

Und die Menge, sie lacht, und der eine wird bleich,
 Aber der andre: 'Dacht' es gleich;
 Das alte Lied vom Schaden und Spott—
 Lachen wir mit, *Sir Walter Scott!*'

The name of the distinguished Sir Walter is heard, and immediately the way is made clear for the entry of Scott and his friend. Even the Fusiliers have to wait until the two have entered the Abbey.

Der Weg ist offen, der Weg ist frei,
 Sir Walter betritt die Westminster-Abtei.
 Die Schotten flüstern: 'Das war *er!*'
 Der Kronungszug kam weit hinterher.

Fontane thus pays a pleasing compliment to Scott, but his memory has evidently played him a trick, for while Sir Walter was present at the coronation ceremony, he did not hold up the procession. Fontane poetises an incident which really took place *after* the coronation, and this event is described somewhat fully in Lockhart's *Life of Scott* as follows: 'At the close of this brilliant scene, Scott received a mark of homage which delighted him. . . . Missing his carriage, he had to return home on foot from Westminster, after the banquet—that is to say, between two and three in the morning;—when he and a young gentleman his companion found themselves locked in the crowd, somewhere near Whitehall, and the bustle and tumult were such that his friend was afraid some accident might happen to the lame limb. A space for the dignitaries was kept clear at that point by the Scots Greys. Sir Walter addressed a serjeant of this celebrated regiment, begging to be allowed to pass by him into the open ground in the middle of the street. The man answered shortly that his orders were strict—that the thing was impossible. While he was endeavouring to persuade the serjeant to relent, some new wave of turbulence approached from behind, and his young companion exclaimed in a loud voice: "Take care, Sir Walter Scott, take care!" The stalwart dragoon, on hearing the name, said: "What! Sir Walter Scott? He shall get through anyhow!" He then addressed the soldiers near him—"Make room, men, for Sir Walter Scott, our illustrious countryman!" The men answered: "Sir Walter Scott!—God bless him!" and he was in a moment within the guarded line of safety.'

GERALD W. SPINK.

REVIEWS

The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry. With Introductory Chapters by R. W. CHAMBERS, MAX FORSTER and ROBIN FLOWER. Printed and published for the Dean and Chapter of Exeter Cathedral by Percy Lund. Humphries & Co., Ltd., London. 1933. viii + 94 pp.; 130 ff. collotype facsimile. £10. 10s. 0d.

The oft-mooted plan of a facsimile reproduction of the famous *Exeter-Book*, the greatest treasure of the Cathedral library, has at last been realised, and students of Anglo-Saxon language and literature and O.E. history as well as the palæographer are indebted to the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral and to the energy of the Hon. Librarian, Prebendary Herbert E. Bishop, for this fine and sumptuous publication. The value of this full-scale reproduction is greatly enhanced by the prefaced seven chapters and two notes associated with the well-known names of Professor R. W. Chambers, Professor Max Förster and Dr Robin Flower. Here we have a true labour of that scholarly love for a unique source of Anglo-Saxon poetry which does not consider the smallest point negligible—be it the fold of a leaf, a missing or mutilated letter or the strips used for binding the preliminary matter of the *Exeter-Book* proper. No wonder, therefore, that the real beginning of the prayer on fol. 117 *b*, hitherto overlooked by previous editors, did not escape them (cf. p. 42), or that the attentive eye of Professor Förster should discover the fine and yet significant difference of dotting between rune-groups and single runes as set forth by him in chap. v, p. 62, n. 21.

Together with the *Vercelli-Book*, the *Cædmon* MS. Junius 11 of the Bodleian and the *Beowulf-Judith* Codex of the British Museum the *Exeter-Book*, the gift of the Lotharingian Leofric, bishop of Crediton and Exeter (cf. chap. i, pp. 5 ff.) to his Cathedral, constitutes one of the four great collective MSS. in the vernacular which, though undated, can for palæographical reasons be ascribed to the period between c. 970 and the beginning of the eleventh century. There may even have been a greater number. Who can prove that the scanty fragments of the *Waldere* or those of the *Fight at Finnesburh* are not the sadly mutilated remains of similar collections—heroic pieces side by side with religious and moral ones?

Professor Chambers has in chap. i admirably pointed out the relation of these great codices 'to the many strands which united to make up O.E. civilisation,' and how especially the *Exeter-Book* in its composition bears witness to the remarkable fact that 'in England the world of Germanic tradition and poetry was brought into close connexion with a Christianity, neither provincial nor insular in outlook.' Here the royal house, the house of Cerdic, might trace its descent from Woden, thirteenth in descent from Noah, whilst in North Germany the neophyte had to forswear *Thuner ende Uuoden ende Saxnot*.

The Benedictine reform with its revival in culture and handwriting, 'the servant of culture,' we readily connect with the sudden rise of these great Codices which, independent of each other and with very little overlapping indeed, have brought the bulk of Anglo-Saxon poetry down to our days. The endeavour to provide palatable religious and ethical instruction for the novices and the laymen may have been the *spiritus movens* of these collections in the vernacular and a certain antiquarian interest may also have played a part. But another factor must not be forgotten applicable at least to the *Exeter-Book* (cf. the last paragraphs of chap. VII) and the *Beowulf* MS., i.e. a conscious collaboration of church and laity, in as far as a layman of noble descent, interested in native poetry—both religious and secular—may have ordered an anthology of this kind at the *scriptorium* of a befriended monastery, he perhaps himself providing some of the sources from his library. Possibly such collaboration may help to explain the interpolations in *Widsuth*, *Deor* and elsewhere.

MSS. like individuals are either garrulous, i.e., they readily yield the date sometimes even the hour and place of their birth, the baptismal and surname of the scribe, occasionally even a trait of his character, piety, greed, etc.; or they are taciturn. In this latter class must be reckoned the *Exeter-Book*. The editors, therefore, had no easy task in revealing some of its individuality.

Two circumstances proved of help. Previous to rebinding at the British Museum the MS. was taken out of the old binding (from about the year 1700) and this enabled Professor Förster to make a thorough study of the original conditions of the single gatherings and thus determine the reason for the irregularity in the number of leaves of some gatherings which show no textual gaps. It appeared (chap. v, pp. 56 ff.) that of the XVII unmarked gatherings of the *Exeter-Book* proper three, i.e., II, XV, XVI, consisted from the outset of seven leaves—instead of the usual eight—that is of three sheets and one half-sheet folded in with its edge turned round, and that gathering VI=fol. 45–52 contained even two such half-sheets, so that it has the appearance of a complete, regular quaternion. The large size of the sheets wanted was responsible, Professor Förster thinks, for the scribe having to content himself with half-sheets. One could suggest in addition that the scribe at times spoiled the work on a half-sheet in one way or the other, removed it, rewrote the text on the next sheet leaving, however, the (right or left) half-sheet in its rightful place.

Some unsolvable questions remain which even textual gaps—these only go to prove the loss of at least seven leaves in the interior of the volume—cannot settle. So, for instance, the extent of the loss before fol. 8 (the opening of the *Exeter-Book* proper), also that between fol. 52 and 53 (strip of 7 cm. cut from the top; the only loss?) which unrolls the vexing *Azarias* question. Puzzling also is the last gathering, fol. 126–30, which consists 'of five single leaves with their backs worn away and now glued to each other.' No evidence, Professor Förster rightly says, is available that several leaves are missing after fol. 130 as was

suggested by A. S. Cook; but Cook's view is evidently shared by Dr Flower when he (p. 90) speaks of the *Exeter-Book* as one which has lost leaves at the beginning and the end on which there might have been inscriptions.

Besides better facilities for determining the structure of the gatherings and thus elucidating the MS.-anatomy, unexpected assistance for localising its origin within nearer confines arose from the discovery (by Kenneth Sisam) of the remarkable script-resemblance between the *Exeter-Book* and the Lambeth MS. 149 of *Bede on the Apocalypse*, whereof the facsimile on p. 86 allows us to judge. There is also some similarity—though a much slighter one—to the script of the Salisbury Psalter which seems to hail from Dorset or Wiltshire between 969 and soon after 978. Dr Flower's suggestion (p. 89) will meet with approval, that the *Exeter-Book* and the Lambeth MS. may be placed between 970 and 990 as examples of the writing of the Western *scriptoria*, and that the form of the writing be claimed as representative of a local variety of the careful script which, reviving certain features of the old half-uncial, was a phase of the script-development of the Benedictine reform.

Happily the Lambeth MS. is a little less taciturn than its palæographic twin sister. An inscription betrays that it was given by Æthelwardus dux, in 1018, to a monastery dedicated to St Mary, the name of the house unfortunately being erased, the suggestion Crediton or Exeter must lack definite proof; and the adjoining (later) entry *Leofricus Pater I. P* is at least ambiguous, for one would expect Episcopus if our Leofric was meant. On the other hand, the donor, Æthelwardus dux, can, with tolerable certainty, be identified as the husband of Æthelflæd, daughter of Æthelmær, who was the son of the historian Æthelward of Royal descent and kinsman of Brihtnoth, Ealdorman of a district which included Dorset, Somerset and Devon. Both he and his son are also known as patrons of Ælfric and founders of monasteries. Dr Flower puts forth the hypothesis that the Lambeth MS. and its twin the *Exeter-Book*—perhaps written for the older Æthelward by his order in the same *scriptorium*—may originally have been in his possession and have remained in the family, until the younger Æthelward gave both books in 1018 to the monastery (Crediton?), from whence Leofric brought them to Exeter, for the Lambeth MS. 149 too figures in the donation list of Leofric as *Expositio Bede super apokalipsin* and was there still in the sixteenth century (cf. p. 29, n. 110, and p. 87, n. 3). With our present knowledge this conclusion must remain an ingenious hypothesis to which, however, the personage of the elder Æthelward and his suggested collaboration with a monastic *scriptorium* lends support.

The *Exeter-Book* proper not only suffered the irreparable loss of leaves but also considerable mutilation of the text of the first and last gatherings, i.e., the fol. 8–12 and more severely fol. 118–30. Professor Chambers and Dr Flower devote chap. vi to the most exacting and sight-trying task of transcribing the damaged passages, thus 'to put on record what can, at the present moment, be seen.' A note on the back page of the preface leaf adds a few readings on fol. 8 *a* and 10 *a*, finally obtained

through submitting them to an ultra-violet process by Professor Andrade. An offprint of fol. 8 *a*, kindly sent me by Professor Chambers, proves the visibility of 7 (opening of l. 15) and of *ƿeopðan* (l. 16). The ð, l. 15 in ...*3ua*(ð) and the *a* l. 12 in *ead3(a)* are now also readable and the first and second words of l. 13 seem to me to spell *up* (scribal mistake for *ur*) *ri3ar* (square *a*) for *ri3er*.

Eight folios—the first being blank and unnumbered—precede the *Exeter-Book* proper (= X + fol. 8 to 130 + X (?)). Originally they were almost certainly written for an English Gospel Book, also a gift to the Cathedral by Bishop Leofric and now MS. II. 2. 11 in the University Library, Cambridge, a donation by Archbishop Parker to the University in 1574, to whom the volume was presented by the Dean and Chapter in 1566. The principal item of interest in this preliminary matter is the record (in English) of the gifts and restitutions of Bishop Leofric to the Church and Monastery of St Peter at Exeter (fol. 1 *a*—2 *b*), the original draft of which can be dated between 1069 and February 10, 1072. The book-list enumerates 66 MSS. of which one only—the *Exeter-Book*—is still in the possession of the Cathedral library, whilst of the rest only seventeen, alienated after the middle of the sixteenth century, have so far been found in other English libraries. Professor Förster prints the donation list in full in chap. II, together with a Middle English version from the Exeter Charter No. 2570 and the Latin abstract of Leofric's donation written in a Norman book-hand of the first half of the twelfth century on fol. 3 *a*; he further enumerates in chap. IV the 32 records (three in Latin, the rest in English) of legal transactions, containing conveyances of land, conventions, manumissions (the largest existing record of such in the twelfth century), and releases from service, all these written, on fol. 3 *b*–7 *b*, by several hands in the second quarter of the twelfth century and of palæographic interest, cf., e.g., the regular, trained hand at the top of fol. 6 *a* (No. 18) with the hasty, irregular cursive hand on fol. 6 *b* (No. 30).

The running comment accompanying the texts and enumeration is a masterpiece of topographical and philological interpretation which makes the perusal both interesting and instructive, last but not least from a lexicographical point of view (cf. chap. II, nn. 43–5, 49, 50, 53, 55 f., 59, 61–3, 68, 80).

Difficulties remain. Cf., e.g., n. 70: *guðfana* 'a military standard' and *fyrð-wæn* 'a military waggon,' war material amidst very incongruous surroundings. Can the first, Professor Förster questions, simply mean a church banner and the latter be a corruption for **fyr-panne* 'fire-pan'? As, however, the entire MS. tradition is opposed to this reading—the *fyrþ-pan* of the M.E. version is but the frequent scribal mistake of taking the ƿ-rune for *p*—the fault must be charged to a *common*, already corrupted source, but then it is difficult to see how the text from which the M.E. version was ultimately obtained, can, as stated on p. 14, be 'identical with the original draft of the list, after at least two of the later insertions—those about Clist and the three bearskins—had been already made.'

We take farewell of the facsimile edition of the *Exeter-Book* with the feeling that an ambitious task is admirably fulfilled and that a work of untiring diligence which emanated from a monastic *scriptorium* nearly one thousand years ago, a rare and precious witness of an even then centuries-old Germanic poetry, lies before us in a faithful reproduction, embellished with a commentary worthy of such a monument.

R. PRIEBSCH.

VIENNA.

The Paris Psalter and the Meters of Ælthius. Edited by GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP. (*The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*, v.) New York: Columbia University Press; London: George Routledge and Sons. 1933. lv+239 pp. 18s.

This is the fifth volume of *The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*, a series which is eventually to include all extant records of Old English poetry. The third and fourth volumes, which are to include the *Exeter-Book* and the *Beowulf* MS., are in preparation. The first two volumes have already appeared and have been reviewed in these pages.

The Paris Psalter is the name given to a collection of Anglo-Saxon metrical translations of the Psalms preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Latin, 8824. It was apparently written in England in the second quarter of the eleventh century and later on found its way into the library of Duke Jean de Berry (1340-1416), brother of Charles V of France, and thence to the Sainte Chapelle of Bourges. Dom Martène found it there in 1708 in a sadly neglected condition. The place where the Sainte Chapelle MSS. were stored was being used as a poultry house, and the books, which were left open on the desks, were in a terrible condition. It passed in 1752 into the collection of the Bibliothèque du Roi (now the Bibliothèque Nationale) at Paris, where it has remained ever since.

The MS. pages are divided into two columns. On the left-hand side stands the Latin text of the Psalms and on the right-hand side the Anglo-Saxon version. The Anglo-Saxon translation of the first fifty psalms is in prose and that of the rest of the Psalter in alliterative verse. These latter are here published. The text of these metrical Psalms has been published on three previous occasions, by Thorpe in 1835, by Grein in 1858 and by Assman in Grein-Wulcker in 1898. A fresh edition of the text is welcome, for both Grein and Assman were somewhat too liberal with their emendations, while Krapp, on the other hand, keeps faithfully to the MS. unless emendation is essential. These metrical renderings of the Psalms began a bad tradition, for they are extremely dull and laboured and very often obscure. The metre is irregular, a fact which may perhaps be due to the late origin of the work. Krapp notes also that 'the style of the metrical translation is but very slightly coloured by memories of traditional Anglo-Saxon epic narrative, and it may be that the translation was made by a person not well acquainted with or not interested in the traditions of Anglo-Saxon epic narrative' (p. xvii). It

is also interesting to note that the Anglo-Saxon translation was not executed from the particular text of the Latin version which appears by its side (p. xviii). With regard to the numbering of the Psalms, Krapp goes curiously astray (p. xiv). The numbering in this Psalter is exactly the same as in the Vulgate. This of course differs from the numbering of the Authorised Version of the Psalms, which follows the Massoretic text.

The Metrical Version of Bæthius's *Consolation of Philosophy* is contained in MS. Otho. A. vi (C) which, like many of the MSS. of the Otho class, was badly damaged by the fire of 1731. Fortunately Junius had made a careful transcript of it, which still survives at Oxford as Junius 12 (J). Alfred's prose version from which the metrical version was made, is found in the same MS. (C), as well as in Bodl. 180, while a page of the prose translation was discovered by Napier in MS. Junius 86. Krapp, following Sedgefield, wrongly describes this as Bodl. 86. Unfortunately the fragment was removed from Junius 86 and subsequently mislaid and has not yet been recovered.

Krapp, on the whole, favours the view that Alfred was the author of both versions. And the evidence seems to be strongly in favour of it. As the critics have pointed out, the metrical version is no great credit to its author, whoever he may be. It is therefore only natural that King Alfred's admirers should be led to attribute the very readable prose version to him and to deny his authorship of the metrical version, substituting a hypothetical clerical scapegoat.

This fifth volume of the *Poetic Records* lives up to the standard of the other volumes which have already appeared. The introduction is full and useful, summing up in a workmanlike way all the recent literature on the subject. The texts are accurately reproduced and the notes are useful to the advanced student, though the beginner would require a good deal more help in the matter of interpretation. One or two misprints may be noted: p. xix, for Malesbury read Malmesbury; p. 206, for Bostworth read Bosworth.

BERTRAM COLGRAVE.

DURHAM.

Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Lief. 3, 4. (*Germanische Bibliothek*, IV, 7.) Von F. HOLTHAUSEN. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1932, 3. Each 80 pp. 3 M.

These two parts cover the alphabet from *his-līc* to *sticcian*. In the first notice the general characteristics were indicated, and it need only be added that the present parts show the same careful and exact scholarship as their predecessors. Some of the omissions are as before rather surprising. We might have expected *hrindan* and *mierð(u)* as usually assumed in *Beowulf*, ll. 1363, 810, further *horig*, (*stān*)-*rocc*, *st(e)allere*, and *stellan*, which is to appear rather strangely, as it seems, as *stiellan* 2. An indication might profitably have been given on the (more or less) dubious words and forms, e.g., *behlæðan*, *hrān* (hardly authentic O.E.),

hwæst, *æmynde* n., which is properly *æmynd* f., *spīderwiht*, *sæld*, 'dwelling,' which occurs once in *Gen. B.* and is not English. As to the rest, doubts occur about the form of *hlīsa*, *hlyttrian*, *sigel* (= 'sun' and the rune-name), *stænht*, which are better as *hlīsa* (*hlīgsa*), *hlyttr(i)an*, *sygel* (and distinguished from *sigel*, *sigle*, 'jewel, necklace'), *stænht(e)*. Doubts occur also about the identification of *seðel*, *seld* with *setl*, in form rather to be associated with *seotul* and Goth. *sittls*, of *spāðl*, *spāld* with *spāt*l, etc., about the attribution of the plurals *scerero*, -oro, etc., to *scear* 'plough-share', the etymology of *mundlēow*, explained (twice) as from O.Ic. *munnlau*g, and other points. The masc. gender of *medu* is based, so far as I know, solely on the hopelessly corrupt passage in *Finnsburh*, *hwōsan* occurs also in the indic. pl. (*hwōsað*), and Bradley's ingenious explanation of *gumrodor* might have had mention. If the North. *sceacere* really has Germ. *ē* how are we to explain the diphthong, and if *of(o)st* is from **of-āst* whence comes the umlaut in *æfest*, *æf(e)stan*?

R. GIRVAN.

GLASGOW.

Vollständiges Wörterbuch zur sog. Caedmonschen Genesis. Von THEODOR BRAASCH. (Anglistische Forschungen, 76.) Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1933. vii+157 pp. 10 M.

The value of this work lies in the complete register of occurrences, even of particles and the commoner words incompletely given in Grein's *Sprachschatz*. Text and interpretation are largely determined by the editions of Holthausen and Klaeber, with naturally continual recourse to Grein. As far as tested the references appear complete and trustworthy. It is convenient that citations from *Genesis B* are distinguished; it would also have been convenient if compounds had been listed under the second element as well as under the first. The author has been generous in admitting conjectural emendations (not always necessary), but mostly he has been careful to record the manuscript reading. In the head-words it might have been better to have rejected altogether the improbable *ā-hwettan*, since *ahwet* (l. 406) must be from the verb found in O.S. as *forhuātan*, O.H.G. *far-*, *fir-*, *uwrthar-huuāzzan* 'curse, ban,' and if really English its form doubtless would be *ā-hwētan* (dialectally *ā-hwētan*), not *ā-hwātan* as given after Klaeber; *ā-wæcnan* and *on-wæcnan* should not be separated, or at all events should have a cross-reference; *mæg* 'Jungfrau' has a short vowel and should have a reference to *mæg(e)ð* of which it is properly the nom. sg.; the form *þurhlonge* is doubtful, still more doubtful the meaning 'dauernd, fortwährend'; *searo* is given (by misprint?) as masc.; *swīðost* (ll. 337, 351) explained as an adj. acc. sg. fem. is really an adverb. The meanings assigned do not call for comment. There are several misprints, but few are likely to cause inconvenience.

R. GIRVAN.

GLASGOW.

A Grammar of the Buchan Dialect (Aberdeenshire), Descriptive and Historical: Vol. I, Phonology—Accidence. By EUGEN DIETH. Cambridge: Heffer and Sons. 1932. xxii + 213 pp. 12s. 6d.

This is one of the most valuable and impressive of recent contributions to English Philology. Dr Dieth, who is a Professor of English at Zurich University, not only clearly shows how intimate is his knowledge of both past and present forms of the Buchan dialect, and of course, of historical English, but also draws upon (Indo-)Germanic, (Swiss-)German, Icelandic and Gaelic in order to illustrate his phonetic and historical explanations. Although the book never ceases to demand the closest attention, it is always stimulating and interesting. Dr Dieth must certainly be complimented upon his command of English and his ability to write so pleasantly.

The work differs from other dialect monographs in several respects. It is divided, not into chapters, but into Parts I and II, which deal respectively with Phonology and Accidence. A very considerable amount of the author's information, chiefly phonetic and historical matter, is conveyed in the form of Notes (cf., e.g., §§ 60, 63, 66, 69); and footnotes abound. At times, therefore, the reader may easily neglect the main theme in order to explore other channels of interest. Several excellent kymographic tracings of Buchan pronunciations are reproduced in proof of statements about consonantal sounds. Unlike most of our dialectologists, Dr Dieth has classified his dialect forms according to the vowel phonemes they now contain, rather than according to their ancestral vowels. Such an 'unhistorical' arrangement is considered justifiable because '(1) it admits of a better idea of the modern state of things' and '(2) M(utschmann)¹ has gone the other way and followed up the fate of the M.Sc. vowels to the present day' (§ 17). Nevertheless, few but specialists are likely to make great use of the book and to most of them the fate of the M.Sc. vowels in the living dialect will be of paramount interest. As things are, the omission of a Tabular Summary of the existing representation of the mediæval vowel system definitely handicaps the reader. Other novelties are the unalphabetical arrangement of the Bibliography, the List of Abbreviations, and the dialect words illustrating the section of the 'Vowels of Accented Syllables.' In this last case, the order is determined by the consonant (or absence of a consonant) after the vowel concerned. The Index refers to pages; but references to paragraphs would have been more helpful. There is one error in the List of Corrections and Additions (pp. xiv-xv): for 'p. 153' (p. xv, l. 41), read 'p. 155.' There is also a reference to a non-existing § 185 (p. 9, n. 2). Yet misprints appear to be most rare.

The dialect recorded here is, strictly speaking, that of West Buchan, and of a single farmstead in particular; but the whole of Buchan, except for the fishing villages on the coast, employs a more or less uniform type of speech (pp. xvi and xvii). This district forms part of that huge region previously investigated by Mutschmann, but there are frequent dis-

¹ *A Phonology of the North-Eastern Scotch Dialect*, by Heinrich Mutschmann. Bonn, 1909.

crepancies (not solely confined to obsolete forms) between the two accounts. In the course of his researches, Dr Dieth has obviously made phonetic records of dozens of colloquial phrases and sentences; and he has succeeded in bringing together a most impressive collection of strange words. Yet 'much of the original vocabulary' must have been 'lost by now' (p. xix). The possibility of Gælic influence on the dialect is never lost sight of, but, in point of sounds and grammatical forms, 'there is little foundation or necessity for assuming any Gælic influence worth mentioning' (p. xxi).

The material has been most thoroughly explored, whilst the task of etymologising in that part of the work devoted to the Accented Vowels has been successfully tackled. Sometimes the etymologies of the *O.E.D.* are questioned. A new derivation for *marrow* 'mate' is suggested, viz. O.E. **ge-mearha*, with the sense of 'he who shares the horse with another' (p. 32, n. 3). In an interesting section on the Quality of Vowels (§§ 71-81), Dr Dieth discusses in detail the shortening of long vowels before plosives and unvoiced fricatives—(? inadequately) described as 'Stopping,' a restrictive term coined by J. A. H. Murray—and the shortening caused by suffixes. The section is well illustrated by kymographic records. The paragraph on Glides is not easy to follow. 'After the long vowels (except [ɑː].) and diphthongs, final [r, l, n] tend to constitute a syllable of their own, thereby calling forth a glide. This glide may develop to a full-blown vowel—thus creating disyllabism' (§ 82). Hence, e.g. [e:ɛ] and [o:ɛ] 'cannot be said to make real diphthongs since they partake of two syllables' (§ 16). All this is a little puzzling to one unacquainted with Buchan conditions. In the instructive account of the Vowels in Unaccented Syllables, the point is made that, throughout the speech of the north-east (except for the coast), the current vowels of unstressed syllables are determined, not by tradition, but by the stressed vowel of the stem and the intervening consonant. 'This phenomenon of vowel-harmony is purely phonetic and therefore not interfered with by analogy or functional and syntactical consideration, except in one case' (§ 85). Stresses fall, in principle, as in St.E.; but in Buchan the weight of stress on weakly accented syllables is much heavier. In fact, disyllables are almost pronounced with level stress' (§ 92). The past participle always ends in syllabic [n] and is consequently differentiated from both the present participle and the gerund, which always end in a vowel + *n* (§§ 87 (4), 143). The consonants are treated very fully, not only phonetically, but comparatively and historically. Attention is called to the small amount, or even total absence of aspiration of the plosives [p, t, k], which is rightly regarded as a most important difference between Buchan (and Scots generally) and St.E. The aspiration varies according to the position of the consonant in the word. The well-marked consonantal peculiarity of North-East Scots (and of Buchan), viz. [f] for O.E. *hw*-, is dealt with at some length (§§ 124 ff.). The change is not due to Gælic influence, as Murray would have us believe, but is a mediæval native development, viz. [xΔ] < [fΔ] < [f]. In Part II, the account of the Strong Verbs deserves special mention. The book concludes with three phoneti-

cally rendered dialect specimens which at first sight are not too intelligible to at least one Sassenach.

Professor Dieth is to be congratulated upon an excellent piece of work. The second volume on Syntax now in course of preparation will, we hope, soon be forthcoming.

HAROLD ORTON.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

An Index of British and Irish Latin Writers, A.D. 400-1520. Compiled by J. H. BAXTER, C. JOHNSON and J. F. WILLARD. Paris: Champion. 1932. 115 pp.

This useful list is an extract from the *Bulletin Du Cange*, vol. VII, and is printed in France. There are nine hundred entries, but many of these are references not to persons but to works of unknown authorship. Even so the number of Mediæval Latin writers in these countries alone is striking. Yet the list does not profess to be exhaustive nor to classify the writers. Theodore of Tarsus is included as he lived and wrote in England, so is Columbanus who spent most of his life abroad. The authors hope that it may serve as a basis for a fuller list and the reviewer shares the hope.

The majority of the writers belong to Britain; those that are Irish have the word *Ireland* printed opposite the entry number, but it is sometimes badly placed, e.g., on p. 1, where it belongs to numbers 6 and 7 not as it would appear to 5 and 6. The entries are divided into groups according to centuries, alphabetically within the groups. This method has its advantages, but its carrying out is open to a few criticisms. Making every allowance for uncertainty about dates, surely Asser, whose life of Alfred was written in 893, ought to be in the ninth century and not alongside Byrthferth who was a century his junior? Abbo of Fleury, a contemporary of Byrthferth, is put forward to the eleventh century. It is strange too that Giraldus Cambrensis is put in the century after his friend Walter Map, and that Tatwin is regarded as a ninth-century writer rather than an eighth. References are given to existing printed texts; references to manuscripts of unpublished matter are generally not given. Authors who wrote partly in England and partly abroad present a difficulty. Thus on p. 33 the grammatical poems of Serlo of Wilton are mentioned and the manuscript referred to is presumably the one in the British Museum. But there are other unpublished poems of Serlo in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Perhaps therefore the words 'English works only' should have been added, as is done in entry 76. These, however, are small defects arising chiefly from the triple authorship. The Index will be extremely useful and is well produced (on p. 14 for S. T. read S. J. Crawford). There is a supplementary list of other documents, registers, accounts and the like, which are also being read for the Mediæval Latin Dictionary Committees.

T. A. SINCLAIR.

LONDON.

Three Chaucer Studies. By RUSSELL KRAUS, HALDEEN BRADY and C. ROBERT KASE. New York; Oxford University Press. 1932. vii+182+101+89 pp. 15s.

Three of Professor Carleton Brown's students in the Chaucer Seminary of the University of New York are the authors of a very interesting volume on matters concerned with 'the father of English poetry.' Mr Kraus, an earlier article of whom appeared in *Modern Language Notes*, June, 1932, writes on the relationship of Thomas Chaucer to the poet in a study called 'Chaucerian Problems.' Mr Brady publishes a paper on the date and occasion of *The Parlement of Foules*. Mr Kase contributes an essay on the position of groups D, E and G in the manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*.

The problem of the paternity of Thomas Chaucer involves the questions: who was Geoffrey Chaucer's wife? and when did the marriage take place? It has been argued, and a recent argument is that of Langhan in *Anglia*, XLIV, p. 297, that Chaucer was married in 1374 to a lady of his own name called Philippa. Kraus controverts this opinion. Chaucer's wife, he says, was Philippa Roet. They were married by 1366, and probably first established a home of their own in 1374. A further investigation concerns the tomb of Thomas Chaucer and of Matilda his wife in Ewelme church. It is a rectangular tomb in the form of a Gothic sarcophagus. On the stone lid are flat effigies in brass of Thomas and Matilda. Above Thomas are the Roet arms, above Matilda those of Burghersh: below Thomas are the arms of Roet and Burghersh quarterly (representing his marriage), below Matilda the arms of Roet impaling Burghersh (representing her marriage). On the sides and ends of the tomb are twenty coats of arms of collaterals, including those of John of Gaunt impaling Roet (the arms of Katharine Swynford after her marriage to Gaunt in 1396), and of their children, the Beauforts. The conclusion which Kraus derives is that the mother of Thomas Chaucer was a sister and a coheirress of Katharine Swynford, hence his use of the Roet arms, and that either Geoffrey Chaucer 'was not the father of Thomas, or that for some reason (perhaps the superior position of his wife), Thomas, or Thomas's survivors, ignored and disowned him.'

Kraus then goes on to discuss the appointment of Geoffrey Chaucer to be under-forester of North Petherton, and here he opens up a new episode in Chaucer's life. Roger Mortimer, Earl of March, was seven years old when, in 1381, his father Edmund died; and in 1382 the bailiwick of Petherton, Exmoor, etc., was granted during the minority of the heir to Sir Peter Courtenay. When the Earl of March received livery of his estates in 1393, Courtenay leased from him Newton Plecý with Petherton and other Somersetshire forests for £40 a year. Kraus states that 'since Chaucer was first appointed to the forestership in 1390-1, he must have been appointed by Courtenay, rather than by the Earl of March. Roger was killed in Ireland on July 20, 1398. His son Edmund, born in 1381, did not receive livery of his lands until 1413 immediately after the accession of Henry V.' Thus Courtenay held the bailiwick con-

tinuously until his death in 1405, and both Chaucer's first appointment in 1390-1 and his second in 1398 were by Sir Peter Courtenay, and not by the Earl or the Countess of March as had hitherto been supposed. The theory that Chaucer held the under-forestership through the influence of his relatives, the Heyrons, is untenable. Chaucer simply held a minor appointment by favour of Sir Peter Courtenay, who was Constable of Windsor Castle in 1390-1, when Chaucer was repairing St George's Chapel there.

On the other hand in 1413 Thomas Chaucer leased the Somerset forests for £50 per annum from the Earl of March. Geoffrey in his day was under-forester; Thomas was bailiff. There is no sequence of offices. But to the reviewer it seems that Thomas Chaucer found some satisfaction in localities which Geoffrey had occupied; else why should he have leased the Westminster dwelling too. Kraus then springs his mine, which is that Thomas Chaucer was really one of Gaunt's bastards by Philippa Roet, the sister of another of Gaunt's mistresses, Katharine Swynford; and that his good marriage and worldly success were due to Gaunt's fatherly care. This, he says, explains Gaunt's patronage of Thomas, Philippa and Geoffrey. It would explain Thomas's use of the Roet arms. It would also explain why Geoffrey and Thomas were never mentioned in official documents as father and son.

I am afraid that this particular mine misfires. The matter needs more definite proof. This theory seems to the reviewer improbable; for the affair with Philippa—Mr Kraus conjectures the date of Thomas's birth as 1373 or 1374—must have coincided with the beginning of the affair with her sister Katharine. It seems incredible, not only that Chaucer should marry a cast-off mistress of Gaunt as one of his rewards for the *Boke of the Duchess*, but that Gaunt should make two sisters his paramours, and both at the same time. Thomas Chaucer's rise to wealth might be explained partly by ability, partly by the facts that his mother was a demoiselle of Gaunt's wife, that his father belonged to the circle of Gaunt's servants and friends, and that his aunt was at first Gaunt's mistress, and later, after the death of Constance in 1394, his third wife. Thomas Chaucer appears to have used the Chaucer seal and arms, but later he adopted the Roet arms of his mother. This is not inexplicable. The Chaucers were merchants, nothing more. The Roets were a knightly family and exceedingly well connected. Thomas could quarter the arms, or use either. He used first one, and then the other, which happened to be the best. This fact merely shows that Thomas was a man of common sense.

I have read Mr Kraus's study with great interest, particularly for his lucid explanation of the forestership of Somerset, but I prefer to think with Thomas Gascoigne, a contemporary Chancellor of Oxford, that Thomas Chaucer was Geoffrey's son.

Mr Braddy writes on the meaning of *The Parlement of Foules*. It will be remembered that the view which is generally held is one proposed by Professor John Koch first in 1877. It is that the poem was composed in 1381-2 to celebrate the wooing by Richard II of Anne of Bohemia.

It is an attractive theory, but it has its difficulties, notably the identification of the three suitors, for there were not three candidates aspiring for her hand at the same time; and in the inconclusive ending of the poem, which makes no definite mention of betrothal or of marriage. Braddy accepts an allegorical meaning in the poem and believes it refers to negotiations for the marriage of Richard II; but he would alter the occasion to the negotiations for his marriage to the Princess Marie of France, a child of seven, in 1377. Chaucer took a minor part in these negotiations under Sir Guiscard d'Angouleme and Sir Richard Stury, which were terminated by the death of the princess in May, 1377. Braddy has a difficulty in finding three suitors. Besides Richard II he can find William, son of Duke Albert of Bavaria; but the third eludes him, and like Betsey Prig he says 'I don't believe there's no such a person,' and ascribes the third tercel to a literary convention. Braddy finds confirmation of his theory in Venus 'north-north-west' (l. 117) which he says—and he has astronomers' evidence for his statement—could only happen in 1374, 1377 and 1382. He urges that the poem was written in April, 1377. The death of little Princess Marie in May would account for the fact that the poem has no sequel.

Mr Braddy's paper is well documented and carefully argued. Whether he proves his point or not, he throws considerable light on the negotiations for marriage between Richard II and Marie, and incidentally on Chaucer's life immediately before the second journey into Italy. His theory is attractive and very worthy of consideration.

Mr Kase's study is an investigation into the original order of the *Canterbury Tales*, based on photostatic prints in the seminar of Professor Manly in the University of Chicago. He shows that the seeming disorder in the various groups of manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales* is really due to the vagaries of groups D, E and G, and he finds that the order AB'F'F²CB²HI is common to all manuscripts when D, E and G are not considered. This evidence is based on an examination of the order of 57 manuscripts, and his theory of the arrangement is clearer than any which has hitherto been proposed.

The three authors of this volume are to be congratulated, not so much for proposing rival theories, as upon the conduct of their investigations, which have led them to new conclusions through an intricate maze of records and facts. These studies call for the serious consideration of all students of Chaucer and his works.

G. H. COWLING.

MELBOURNE.

Dramatic Irony in Chaucer. By GERMAINE DEMPSTER. (Stanford University Publications: Language and Literature, Vol. iv, No. 3.) Stanford: University Press; London: H. Milford. 1932. 102 pp. 9s.

Miss Dempster's study gives a readable analysis of its subject in relation to Chaucer's indebtedness and artistic development. The author shows how in *Troilus and Criseyde* Chaucer enlivened the conventional

comments of Boccaccio through his deeper interest in the ironies of situation and speech and character. The three notable additions apart from the epilogue and soliloquy on freewill are episodes of comic irony. 'But Chaucer went much farther than to rework the *Filostrato* with eloquent appreciation of the dramatic irony in it, much farther than learning Boccaccio's method of commenting rather insistently on the ironies of Fate, farther even than acquiring the master's talent for detecting or creating tragic or amusing irony; he developed a sense for new effects, for irony of a subtler character than any emphasized in the *Filostrato*, touches often too subtle and indefinite for any comment on his part to be desirable.'

It is the merit of the work to show how in his later tales Chaucer developed 'a light, reticent, completely objective method of presenting the ironies of action'; this is aided by an admirable comparison of the 'fabliaux' with their foreign analogues (especially in the *Reeve's* and *Merchant's Tales*), while such stories as *The Wife of Bath* and the *Pardoner* are used to reveal the method as applied to other kinds of matter.

Not the least interesting chapter concerns the narratives with little or no dramatic irony. Miss Dempster explains the relative lack of the device in the *Knights Tale* as due to a simplification of characterisation which in turn she attributes to an attempt at putting a problem of courtly love. (We might prefer simply to emphasize the sheer exigencies of an unpalatable plot.) On the other hand the absence of dramatic irony from the three pious legends is due to their Christian tone. 'The very definiteness of such a background greatly limits the effectiveness of possible irony of action. For really striking dramatic irony always involves an element of uneasy intellectual surprise at those mysterious forces that seem to take pleasure in creating incongruities in our lives.' But 'the Christian Providence back of the legends of saints is a power too simple in its goodness to take any pleasure in weaving absurdities.' Such remarks, read together with the brief discussion of determinism in *Troilus*, are illuminating, and one feels that much more might have been made of them in the Conclusion. It seems certain that the literary stimulus for the adoption of a conscious and reflective irony came from Boccaccio, and the transition to a more objective and impersonal method owed something to French influence. But what does the study of this central element in Chaucer's technique tell us of the poet's apprehension of life? Miss Dempster risks no suggestions, yet if one generalisation emerges from her work it is this: that Chaucer's imagination passed through three stages of development. In the first his unreflective acceptance of the traditional and allegorical reveals a boyish freshness without profound interest in man or life's problems—hence an absence of irony; next, entering more fully into the classical and mediæval heritage, he becomes more humane, even speculative, as he looks on the tragi-comedy of fortune and the diversity of men. Too sunny and too unphilosophic for scepticism, he accepts without question both the Christian and the Boethian doctrines of providence and fate, and the force of tragic irony in *Troilus* arises not only from the opposition between

character and circumstance, but, as Miss Dempster suggests, from the vagueness and mystery of this acceptance of irreconcilables. This analytic and reflective phase is Chaucer's nearest approach to a metaphysic of human action. In his later work he rises above it—not merely through literary influences such as the 'fabliaux' (why did he choose them?) but because he ceased to trouble about ultimate problems, and with true mediæval realism swam happily upon the surface of things, contenting himself with regarding life's little ironies as a comic or pathetic spectacle, with the final significance of which he as an artist in story had no concern.

G. BULLOUGH.

EDINBURGH.

The Book of Fayttes of Armes and of Chyualrye, translated and printed by William Caxton from the French original by Christine de Pisan. Edited by A. T. P. BYLES. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1932. lvi+315 pp. 21s.

Mr Byles has continued with gratifying results his work of making Caxton's translations more available, and in giving us this first reprint of *The Book of Fayttes of Armes and of Chyualrye* he has supplied a long-felt want. This work is one of the most important for studying Caxton's methods and gifts as a translator. The style shows a greater maturity than does his earlier work; there is a firmer control of the sentence structure and a wider range of vocabulary. It is because of this undoubted improvement in style that the editor would claim for Caxton a higher place in the history of English prose than Professor R. W. Chambers in his admirable essay on *The Continuity of English Prose*¹ is prepared to admit. Though Professor Chambers may not have given adequate attention to this more notable work of Caxton, his main thesis that 'Capgrave, Caxton, even Malory are but tributary to the main stream of continuous English prose'² is difficult to refute. Even at its best, Caxton's work is marred by the inordinate use of tautological synonyms, a trick of style which is seldom effective. In the musical prose of *The Book of Common Prayer*, which abounds in examples of this stylistic feature, the repetition is often quite effective in its emphasis and sonority. There is no such justification for it in Caxton's work, and the use of no less than three hundred pairs of synonyms in *The Fayttes of Armes* is unpardonable. Despite a certain awkwardness in constructions, Caxton's prose is, however, essentially readable, and those who are familiar only with the earlier translations would do well to study this later work.

The book is a storehouse of rare words, of which very few found their way into the *New English Dictionary*. For a supplementary Early Modern Dictionary it should yield a rich harvest of words. *Betun* 'cement' is not noted in *N.E.D.* until 1819. Mr Byles has wisely confined his glossary to rare words and words used in peculiar and unmodern

¹ The Introduction to Harpsfield's *Life of More*, edited by E. V. Hitchcock and R. W. Chambers, E.E.T.S., 1932.

² *Ibid.*, p. cxli.

meanings. There seems to be an occasional uncertainty about the Old English forms (e.g. *abye* is derived from *ābiegan*), and *æ* and *œ* are on several occasions confused in the printing. But the editor has spared no effort to give us an accurate reproduction of the original.

The matter of the book is of peculiar interest, especially when the character of Christine de Pisan is borne in mind. Supporting herself and her three children by her pen, she set herself to fight for France and the rights of woman. A good many passages in the book are original and Mr Byles has given us Christine's prologue in her own French version.

The Introduction contains a short account of Christine, a detailed classification and description of the manuscripts of her work, and an account of the printed versions, both French and English. In a subsequent section there is a scholarly treatment of the sources and some supplementary remarks on Caxton as a translator which should be read in the light of what Mr Byles has written on the same theme in his edition of *The Ordre of Chyualry*¹.

The volume is in every way worthy of the standard which the Early English Text Society has set itself in its recent publications.

J. P. OAKDEN.

ST ANDREWS.

The Poems of William Dunbar. Edited by W. MACKAY MACKENZIE. Edinburgh: The Porpoise Press. 1932. xxxix + 272 pp. 12s. 6d.

There have been three editions of Dunbar in comparatively recent times—the Scottish Text Society's of 1893, Schipper's of 1894 and the ill-fated Baidon's of 1907. In the meantime Dunbar has become in some sort a symbol to the Scottish Nationalist and a new edition was as inevitable as it was overdue. All of those mentioned above have been out of print for many years and in any case not one of them was really satisfactory. It will hardly be believed that not one of them should have noted the source of the refrain *Tumor mortis conturbat me* in the Office for the Dead, or that *Egeas* (*Flyting*, v. 537), the proconsul who martyred St Andrew, should have been identified with Ægeon, the hundred-handed giant from Greek mythology. A thorough knowledge of the life and faith of pre-Reformation Scotland is essential to an editor of Dunbar, and it is fortunate that the task—no light one—should have been entrusted to Dr Mackenzie, whose distinguished work on Scots archæology, history and literature is perhaps more highly appreciated outside of Scotland than at home. Any reader of *The Battle of Bannockburn* will know that he has small reverence for tradition as tradition, and, in his excellent introduction on the life and times of Dunbar, he refuses to regard the Court of James IV as 'a forcing-house of literary merit'; the King was far more deeply interested in 'potingary' than in poetry. And in Dr Mackenzie's notes I have only once found him taking over an identification without adequate enquiry—*Of the Warldis Instabilitie*, v. 62, where *Calyecot* is identified with Calcutta, which was an insignificant village till the end of the seventeenth century. The reference

¹ E.E.T.S., 1926.

is of course to Calicut on the Malabar coast, where Vasco da Gama, the first European to reach India by the Cape route, landed in 1498. He got back to Portugal in 1499—which gives the *terminus a quo* of the poem. On the other hand the earlier identification of *Dermtoun* with Darlington is amply supported by the forms cited by Dr Mawer in *The Place-Names of Northumberland and Durham*.

As is reasonable in an edition intended for the general reader as well as for the scholar, the capitalisation and punctuation are modernised; 'thorn' and 'yok' are represented by 'th' and 'y'; and the use of 'u,' 'v,' 'w' and of 'i,' 'j,' has been adjusted to modern practice. Otherwise Dr Mackenzie bases his text on the Chepman and Myllar Print, for what it contains, and then on the manuscript earliest in date, preferring, when other things are equal, the Bannatyne to the Maitland, which appears generally to have been more consciously rehandled. Uniformity of spelling within the individual poem is thus preserved, and only the more important variant readings are recorded in the notes. One may mention, however, that the reading of the Print at v. 532 of the *Flyting* is *tempise*, and it is quite unnecessary to insert [*t*], as was done also by the late G. S. Stevenson in the Scottish Text Society edition of the Chepman and Myllar Print; the form *tempand* occurs at v. 2 of *The Devillis Inquest*. On the other hand (at v. 37 of the *Lament for the Makaris*) *Art, magicianis* should surely be read as *Art-magicianis*, 'practisers of the magic art.'

Reference should have been made to two important pieces of work by American scholars, the late W. H. Schofield's *Mythical Bards and the Life of William Wallace* for the problem of Blind Harry, and P. H. Nichols' *William Dunbar as a Scottish Lydgatian* (P.M.L.A., XLVI, 214-24) on the *Lament for the Makaris*; this latter shows that Villon's influence on Dunbar was much slighter than has been held hitherto.

The satisfactory glossing of Dunbar, especially of the *Flyting* and of *The Tretris of the Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedow*, will always present difficulty. He had an astonishing vocabulary of abuse, and in more than one passage a word marked obscure by Dr Mackenzie is clear enough *sensu obsceno*. Other words, such as *fredome* (47, v. 299), *gane* (35, v. 8), *gentill* (47, v. 316), *kindly* (47, v. 456) and *Trewth* (83, v. 57), are certainly not used in the modern English sense and might have been worth glossing. At 6, v. 76, *cralloun* 'craven' is a troublesome word probably to be associated with *cralloun* and *crachoun*. At 47, v. 455, *cury* means 'dish (of cooked food)'. At 52, vv. 39 and 56, *denger* does not mean 'influence or dominion' but, as frequently in Middle English, 'disdain.' At 47, v. 414, *I wise* is not the first personal pronoun plus verb but an adverb (O.E. **gewisse*). At 6, v. 157, *penmis* is used, I think, in the dialectal sense of 'quills just breaking through the skin of a bird.'

Dr Mackenzie has done his work well and the book is attractively produced at a reasonable price. It can be commended without reserve to those universities which desire to include Dunbar in the prescription for English Honours.

BRUCE DICKINS.

King Johan by John Bale. *Malone Society Reprints*, 1931. London: Oxford University Press. xxxiv + 144 pp.

The text of each edition of *King Johan* previous to this one has been based on that of Collier's edition, 1838, which is grossly inaccurate, unscholarly, and does not contain the two manuscript leaves which Collier forwarded to the Duke of Devonshire in November, 1847. The present edition, prepared by Mr J. H. P. Pafford with the collaboration of the General Editor, Dr W. W. Greg, is edited with scrupulous care and scholarly acumen, and is therefore doubly welcome. The Introduction, which contains much that is new, presents an interesting hypothesis of the history of the play. In brief, the play was written in two parts not later than 1536, recast into a single acting version c. 1538, of which the A-version is a scribe's copy, possibly revised early in Elizabeth's reign c. 1561. This is by far the most plausible theory, though the evidence for an Edwardian recension is admittedly not strong. The suggestion that *King Johan* was performed at the coronation of Edward VI is dismissed on the ground that Bale was absent in Germany at the time; yet it is just possible that some one other than Bale may have produced the play. Indeed, such a performance would have encouraged Bale to revise the play when he returned to England, and again in the reign of Elizabeth in the hope that it might be acted then.

On the question of authorship the editors find no evidence that the A-version and the B-version differ in literary and stylistic qualities as A. W. Ward asserted, *Eng. Dram. Lit.* 1899, i, pp. 177-88.

The statement that Bale 'had certainly left the Roman Church in 1534, probably in 1530, and it may be even earlier' seems extremely cautious. The date 1530 is presumably taken from Strype's *Life of Parker*, i, pp. 283-4. Strype, however, gives no authority for this date. Indeed the evidence that Bale left the Roman Church earlier still is strong. Nicholson, *English Historical Library*, Pt. 11, ch. 8, states that Bale was converted while at Cambridge. Now Bale went up to Jesus College between 1517-19 and proceeded to B.D. in 1528-9, which date may well mark the end of his university career. If so, his conversion was certainly before 1530.

The text arrangement presented unusual difficulties, and the editors are to be congratulated on the way they have overcome them.

J. H. WALTER.

LONDON.

The Works of Edmund Spenser. A Variorum Edition. [Vol. I.] Edited by EDWIN GREENLAW, C. G. OSGOOD, F. M. PADELFORD. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford. 1932. xii + 556 pp. 36s.

Spenser has long engaged the fealty of American scholars—was, indeed, all but abandoned to them—and many notable studies have resulted. Now appears the *magnum opus*, the complete edition of his works, with abundant apparatus compiled by a team of specialists, and produced in

full form by a University Press. This first volume contains the text of Book I of *The Faerie Queene*, with a commentary of 143 pages, then nine appendices occupying 202 pages, a textual appendix, and a bibliography. It is a monument of scholarship, and, like other monuments, must be described in the mass with only such detail as stands forward at a first inspection.

The text given is that of the second quarto, 1596, and the editors have rightly added to Book I the woodcut facing Book II in the quarto but illustrating Book I, and also Spenser's explanatory letter to Raleigh. Since Spenser made some alterations between the first edition of 1590 and that of 1596, the choice of editions is probably right and certainly safe: the extent of his revision is, however, a matter of opinion, and so it must remain. After the most careful study of punctuation, for instance, it is only occasionally that one can ascribe a change to author or to printer with any assurance of certainty. Punctuation is, and always was, a matter of taste, and we should realise and acknowledge how much our preference of one version or another is guided by feeling—trained feeling, no doubt, but feeling. In the text itself the same holds good. The editors here have been laudably conservative, and, taking text and notes together, rigidly accurate to a degree lesser men, and those working single-handed, can only admire and envy. Like all editors they give themselves leave to accept readings from other editions, and that justifiably; but there must always be room for difference, for ultimately taste must decide.

This point is worth making, for when we turn to the Commentary we are faced with the suggestion of an ideal of scientific impersonality, of pure intellectual conclusiveness; and it is arguable whether such an ideal is reasonably possible of attainment or its appearance desirable. The method is that of selection from all previous commentators, fitting their fragments together to cover, as far as possible, the whole field. This is pious, laborious, admirable, but just a trifle dull. The occasional interpolations of the special editor of the volume (Dr Padelford) are so apposite, and expressed with such neat liveliness on occasion, as to make one wish he had done the whole business himself, looting and ransacking earlier commentators with as much acknowledgment as he cared, but making the thing his own. For after all, Jortin or Warton may have printed the note, but Dr Padelford vouches for it, or it would not be here. The effect is cold and external, as if he had not absorbed the stuff and turned it into *sung et nourriture*, and I for one would prefer the life blood of a master commentator to the card-index scruple of a Ph.D. candidate, would have enjoyed an excursus into a personal interest and have noticed less the omission of trifles which have at times caught my attention. For instance, why did Spenser call the beech 'warlike'? I don't know, and so I cannot follow one quirk of his reading. The real interest of a commentary is to watch one mind tracing another. Here we have a cold series which lacks that interest we find in Jortin and Warton and the rest, and which never gets going in a continuous movement.

The same admiration, and the same misgiving, are present at the reading of the Appendices. Here the editors might have borrowed a hint

from the poet, and detailed the whole scheme, even in a loose sheet. A sketch of 'The Plan and Conduct of the Faerie Queene' is a useful introduction, and a series of fourteen short studies of 'The Sources of Book I' is obviously in place. But general discussions of 'The Moral and Spiritual Allegory,' 'The Historical Allegory' and 'The Platonic Element' (vague as usual) of the whole poem, or on 'Spenser and Ariosto as Artists,' are not so strictly required in a commented edition as they would be in a book on Spenser, and those on 'The Character of Una' and 'The Muse of the Faerie Queene' might have been condensed into a note. The same method is followed throughout. Each appendix consists of a series of excerpts from books and papers by various authors, few of them difficult of access and many still in print. It is scarcely fair to an author to quote a page or two nakedly, without the cross-lights of the rest of his book, and the result is occasionally awkward. Here again, the most attractive part is where the editor breaks in to sum up, or to decide a controversy, as in the note on Stephen Hawes, for here we have complete thought instead of *disjecta membra*. There is even a danger that the fear of leaving gaps may, in the opinion of some, have led to the inclusion of mere academic argument, but there is not too much of this, and it is to be hoped that the editors will be stern in future, and refuse to exhibit the corpses of unnecessary hares.

The admiration one cannot but feel for the rest of the book (granted its method) must be withheld from the bibliographical note. The editor promises a complete study later, and we should have been content to wait. To give a bibliographical study of 11½ quires of a 38-quire book is an unworkmanlike procedure: Book I is a separable unit of *The Faerie Queene*, but not of the quarto of 1590. Nor is the matter impeccable. At least two variant readings (of 1590 quartos) are noted in the textual list and omitted in the table of variants—that there are other variants is of no importance, for every extant copy could not be examined. The B.M. quarto C.12.h.17 has not the Welsh word *scuth* 'supplied correctly' at II.10.24. 8-9: it has *sewith* like others, but a former owner, following the 'Faults Escaped,' has scraped away the bars of the e's. It is not enough to say that 'the pagination skips from 78 to 81 and is confused thereafter (more so in 1590 than in 1596) to page 97, which is correctly numbered.' A confusion should be explained where possible, or it leaves no mark on the reader's mind; and here the explanation is obvious. The workman who made up the two outer formes of signature F calculated (correctly) that F 1 was the 81st page of the book, but forgot that the first leaf, containing title-page and dedication, was not numbered, pagination beginning on A 2. So his pagination is + 2 throughout. The inner formes were numbered off correctly: The result, when the two sheets were folded together, is a muddle, and in 1596 the compositor saw that something was wrong; as he began at page 81, he carried straight on to the end of the quire, making his last page 96. Thereafter pagination is correct from page 95 (not 97) on. One might deduce that 1596 was set up from a copy of 1590 broken up into quires. All the rest of the discussion of spellings and punctuation might well wait till the

whole evidence be included; and conclusions could be stated more succinctly.

The whole volume is so full of high intention and scrupulous scholarship that this review may seem ungenerous. I hope it will not be so misunderstood. The basis of criticism is a fundamental difference of ideal. A teacher scarcely dare send his students to these appendices, because assuredly the average human undergraduate is not likely to turn from them to the books from which they are compiled, and so is encouraged in snippet-reading, the curse of departments of 'English.' And he will be misled by the false air of quasi-scientific finality, which is the worst possible atmosphere in which to carry on the study of literature, and which is bound, moreover, to repel the non-professional reader. This is of course unintentional. One cannot but praise unstintedly the honesty, conscience, industry, and thought that have gone to the making of this book. It is full of valuable things. But it has neither soul nor spirit, and it is dangerous to the student. The very reason why it has become so is admirable: but I wish our very capable American colleagues would trust themselves, their tastes and their feelings, be less cautious and more themselves. I for one am not interested in a dramatised 'The Editor': I *am* interested in the views of Professors Greenlaw, Osgood, and Padelford. And, ultimately, there is no 'The Editor.' We each make our contribution: even if it is only a quotation, it is *ours*, and we stand or fall by it. Let us do it in 'the spirit of genial criticism': we may not have singing robes, but we can dispense with lab-coats.

W. L. RENWICK.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

Edmund Spenser; A Critical Study. By B. E. C. DAVIS. Cambridge: University Press. 1933. ix + 267 pp. 12s. 6d. net.

Spenser's life, art and thought, divide this essay into three parts of equal excellence, if not of equal importance. In the introductory chapters Mr Davis says that he has nothing to add to the common stock of biographical knowledge. His account is a photograph of the not very pleasant truth remaining when the veils of unauthorised hypothesis, old and new, have been removed. There is no apology for Spenser, and in its biographical parts the essay is severely objective. The man who emerges lived a life which was far from being a true poem, yet one of the finest qualities of this study is its integration of Spenser's poetry and personality.

That work is best done in the final chapter on 'Philosophical Ideas.' It is done no less effectively, however, in the discussions of imagery, verbal music and diction. In the sections on Spenser's art the contribution to our insight may not be great, but their simple outlines and close, logical interlacing of complex details add measurably to our comprehension of Spenser. From his second page, where he recalls Mulcaster's preference for vernacular to Latin grammar, Mr Davis begins our preparation to understand the conflicting yet harmonious tastes which made the

Calendar a nursery of seeds from old native trees, both dialectal and literary, and *The Faerie Queene* a linguistic Garden of Adonis. When the sixth chapter has been reached, we are prepared for the judgment that, although it is the make-believe language of a make-believe world, compact of 'archaisms, quaint spelling and childish onomatopœia.... designed to catch the eye and ear rather than to stir the mind' (p. 139), yet 'the language of Spenser is the supreme achievement of Elizabethan poetic invention' (p. 153). The treatment of the similes in *The Faerie Queene* as escapes to reality in a poem which Mr Davis regards perhaps too distinctively as an escape from reality polarises the chapter on imagery. Their substance is that of the real world, extended by the literature of travel and of natural history, and especially of the poignantly real yet romantic world which lay about him in Ireland. Like his diction, his imagery is treated as rooted in his environment, and that is why, even when it includes figures which go back to Homer and symbols like Gryll which were the common stock of humanism, it patterns the fabric of his verse with perfect harmony. Although some of the biographical items of the two opening chapters may be questioned, one can only admire the skill with which all factors in Spenser's experience are subordinated to their proper relationship to his growth as an artist, and made to validate the analysis of his art.

By present standards Spenser's personality is neither amiable nor impressive. Mr Davis does not try to convince us that he understood either the politic or the private, moral virtues. The approach to the former is indicated by the observation that, 'Like more than one politician of our own time he regarded the insurgent Irish not as a people struggling for their rights but simply as a "murder gang"' (p. 29). Spenser, it is presumed, 'must have recognised in Lord Grey a thick-skinned soldier' (p. 75). His loyalty to the man's memory in the uninspired *Legend of Justice* is treated as if it were of one piece with his officious flattery of Sidney and Raleigh. Artegall is made an ignominious monument to his failure as a political thinker. No stress is laid upon the fact that his political philosophy corresponded with that of Jean Bodin in the *Methodus* and very little upon his use of chronicle history and Arthurian romance to construct an imperial ideal which would both move and discipline the national imagination. The points of view represented by Professor H. S. V. Jones's *Spenser's Defence of Lord Grey* (1919) and by the articles assembled in Professor Greenlaw's posthumous *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory* (1932) are hardly recognised. Their exclusion must be deliberate, for Mr Davis shows himself a discriminating master of the tangled literature of his subject. One of the most valuable of Professor Greenlaw's points was his insistence that a broad political allegory like that which evidently enters into the Medina incident is a part of Spenser's entire second book. Mr Davis is doubtless right in discounting the suggestion that the episode in Alma's castle is based upon the allegory of the body as a city state in the *De Planctu Naturæ*, but he cannot be right in making its nearest analogue the mediæval *Soul's Ward*. It belongs rather to the centre of the streams, one flowing from Plato's

Republic and the other from sources like the passage on the human body in the *De Natura Deorum* of Cicero, which gained many affluents in the Middle Ages, and in the Renaissance converged in a great current of faith in the power available by self-mastery for both the state and the individual. Although Henry VIII urged the absolute right of the conqueror in Ireland, the doctrine that might makes right was by no means the characteristic, practical aspect of Spenser's 'conception of the State as a harmonious work of art, the security of which must be maintained, if necessary, by violence' (p. 73). Its best practical aspect is Guyon's resistance of Mammon's offer to furnish him with the sinews for a public career.

It is prevailingly in the light of *Soul's Ward* that Mr Davis interprets Guyon. Although he says that, 'With the opening of Book II the Christian note is practically lost' (p. 114), and likens Spenser's ideal to the self-mastery or 'state of inward harmony compared by Plato with political justice' (p. 113), he is inclined to regard Spenser's code of morals as 'the creed of the Stoic reinforced by the dead weight of English Puritanism' (p. 66), and he concludes that, 'The idea of Temperance presented in Book II is much nearer Christian renunciation than Hellenic moderation.' Guyon he makes 'a Puritan celibate embracing the Pauline rule of life' (pp. 116-17). Spenser's treatment of anger he refers to the *Nicomachean Ethics*—disregarding the subordinate place given to that passion in Aristotle's treatise for the civilised Greeks in comparison with the importance of Furor and the angry Pyrochles and of Guyon's early irascibility in Spenser's story—but he ignores the suggestion of two excellent Spenserians that Guyon was created to embody the Aristotelian virtue of continence as Castiglione's *brigata* enthusiastically interpreted that ideal. Dogmatism in these matters is fatal, and the problem is fully to recognise all the factors which entered into the theory of character illustrated by Guyon. Perhaps the inconsistencies of the ideal can be resolved—at least as an historical problem—in the light of the principle of reason as St Thomas Aquinas interpreted it, and as it was reinterpreted and idolatrised by men of all schools, Neo-Platonic, Aristotelian and Stoic and even Epicurean, in the Renaissance. The space at Mr Davis's disposal hardly permits such discussion. He leaves the conflict unresolved, and his readers are led to regard Guyon as the unconscious self-portrait of a celibate official spending his life far from the company of women and the temptations of society, rather than as the expression of a coherent ethical theory. This attitude does not prevent him from writing more sympathetically than one of the best modern interpreters of Spenser about his allegory, and from challenging that interpreter's stigma upon 'the whole of Spenser's "philosophy," apart from his "borrowed Platonism," as "trite, tame, shallow, nerveless"' (p. 211). The chapter on allegory follows that on romance because the critic sees the two topics in natural juxtaposition as kindred elements in Spenser's art. Limits of space confine him to bare outlines and, since less important articles are cited in the notes, specialists may protest against his failure to refer his readers to the standard articles on—for example—Spenser's debt to

Ariosto. His preference for Malory as the determinant Arthurian source is a bold plea for the traditional view, and should be confronted with the evidence for the influence of *Arthur of Little Britain* and of other minor romances which Professor Greenlaw collected (*Studies in Philology*, xxvi, pp. 124 ff.).

The final chapter deals with Spenser's solution of the philosophical problem of an age which had abandoned the Scholasticism on which *The Divine Comedy* was founded but was still too Christian to be 'satisfied with a Pagan Stoicism enjoining repression and the practice of virtue as more or less aimless ideals' (p. 229). Perhaps the greatest merit of the essay is its handling of Spenser's course between the Scylla and Charybdis of obscurantism and scepticism—'a correlation of ethics and metaphysics with the facts of nature, the course necessarily adopted by a poet devoting his greatest work to the broad and comprehensive interpretation of life' (p. 229). Here again, Mr Davis may be challenged for his dogmatism. The influence of Bruno upon Spenser cannot be taken for granted as he takes it, and the weight of evidence recently accumulated by Mrs J. W. Bennett (*P.M.L.A.*, XLVII, pp. 46-80) and by Professor Albright (*P.M.L.A.*, XLIV, pp. 715-59) leaves the burden of proof heavily upon those who would challenge Professor Saurat's opinion that 'les relations toutes générales qu'on a cru trouver entre Spenser et Giordano Bruno relèvent de l'atmosphère intellectuelle du XVI^e siècle' (*Arsbok*, 1924, p. 35). Spenser's use of the expanded figure of the glass in which the divine beauty is reflected (*H.H.B.*, pp. 113-23) is not likely to convince readers familiar with Renaissance Neo-Platonism that he recollected its casual use by Bruno. Mr Davis is right in saying that Spenser uses many of Bruno's illustrations. He might, for example, have remarked anent 'the veritable no-man's land between fancy and imagination' (p. 168) occupied by Scudamour in the House of Care when the clatter of the smiths deafened him, and

Those Pensifenesse did move; and Sighes the bellowes weare,

that the line is an abridgment of Bruno's allegorisation of the tools in the forge of Vulcan (*Opere Italiane*, ed. Giovanni Gentile, II, pp. 416-17). But such parallels—like that of the crab (*F.Q.*, VII, vii, 35), by which Ben Jonson said that Spenser intended the Puritans, to the zodiacal crab, which Bruno made the patron of all ill proceeders (*op. cit.*, p. 49)—only prove the kinship of two minds and the sometime power of symbols which have lost their force. The great distinction of Mr Davis's chapter is his recognition that 'Spenser's scheme is identical with that propounded by Bruno in *De gl' Heroici Furori*, and his recognition that this scheme was the basis of the fusion of ethics and metaphysics into a philosophy which satisfied both men. That philosophy, however, as the researches of M. Charbonnel and Professor Lovejoy have shown, was fundamentally Plotinian, and we know that Spenser drew upon Neo-Platonic sources through Pico della Mirandola. Strangely enough, Pico's influence is not recognised and the reader is given no inkling of the interesting and unambiguous discussion of it which was begun by Professor J. B. Fletcher

more than twenty years ago. The traditional view of Bruno which is represented in Lange's *History of Materialism* is giving way to recognition of the animism which Mr Davis believes that Spenser learned from *La Cena de le Ceneri* and *De la Causa, Principio e Uno*. The limits of the essay prevent more than a bare suggestion of the literary affluents which may have contributed to that animism in both men, and leave no room for treatment of the filtration through which Lucretius reached Spenser. The importance of the myths of Isis, Venus and Adonis, which are part and parcel of Spenser's animism, is admirably sketched, but so briefly that the reader must wish for a sequel on a larger scale to this and to all the topics handled in the final chapter.

MERRITT Y. HUGHES.

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.

Corpus Hamleticum: Hamlet in Sage und Dichtung, Kunst und Musik.
Herausgegeben von J. SCHICK. III. *Das Glückskind mit dem Todes-*
brief: Europäische Sagen des Mittelalters und ihr Verhältnis zum Orient.
Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz. 1932. x + 405 pp.

It is more than twenty years ago, in October 1913 (vol. VIII, p. 569), that this *Review* noticed the appearance of the first volume of Professor J. Schick's extraordinarily learned work, *Corpus Hamleticum: Hamlet in Sage und Dichtung, Kunst und Musik*. The first volume was devoted to versions of a saga, *Das Glückskind mit dem Todesbrief, Orientalische Fassungen*, which was to have been promptly followed by a second volume setting forth the development in the literatures of Europe of the oriental story already encountered in Pali, Sanskrit, etc. (It must be borne in mind that no language is an obstacle to Professor Schick's march.) But the great venture was tragically overclouded, first by the War which took students from their tasks and separated the nations, then by the calamitous inflation, and ultimately by a rise in the cost of book-production which to such a work as this was the last word. Even the new volume tells its own tale. Its publisher is no longer E. Felber, Berlin, but Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig: its introduction is dated 1922. Another ten years of difficulty were to pass before the half-told tale could be resumed. Fortunately we have it at last, written with the author's old brilliance, concision, and critical power, and his amazing command of all his sources.

The main subject of the present volume is therefore the European versions of the story of 'the lucky child with the fatal letter'; of which the earliest is the Byzantine story of the Emperor Constant narrated in French in prose and verse in the thirteenth century. But a less pure form of the story had already existed in Gottfried of Viterbo's *Pantheon* (A.D. 1186), where it was told of the Emperor Conrad II (1024-39) in a curious form, that of a Latin poem in which every pentameter is preceded by two hexameters. Skelton's *Garlande of Laurell* has two pentameters following two hexameters. From Gottfried came probably the prose version of the *Legenda Aurea* of Jacob a Voragine about the year 1260,

and hence that of the *Gesta Romanorum* in which the tale is given an allegorical interpretation and where the name 'Hannibal' is often substituted for 'Conrad,' perhaps from a feeling that history is not really in question. But Professor Schick presses for a critical edition of the *Gesta* based on its countless manuscripts and editions.

All versions of the *Gesta* found in England, though based on the Hannibal stories, have substituted for Hannibal a new name 'Dollinus.' Among them curiously is a poem *Fortunes Tennis Ball* printed by that notorious young plagiarist, Robert Baron, in his *Pocula Castalia* 1650. Martinus Polonus in a Latin prose version follows the *Legenda Aurea* (he is antecedent to the *Gesta*) and introduces into the tale the local colour of Suabia. Hans Sachs is acting upon an earlier suggestion when he turns the story of the *Gesta* into a comedy, of which the hero however is not Hannibal, but King Dagobert of France. The influence of the renaissance is seen when Naclerus (rector of Tübingen University 1477) criticises the truth of the story, and is followed by Trithemius, 1514. The rude dramatisation of Hans Sachs leads us to the courtly work of Lope de Vega 1638, based apparently on the text of Naclerus (he keeps the names Conrado, Henrique and Leopoldo). Here there is a complete absence of local colour and Gaston Paris takes occasion to reproach German literary critics for preferring the Spanish drama to the French. Professor Schick is, however, moved to a sharp rejoinder and being a mathematician no less than a literary critic proclaims that the French genius is seen at its best, not in its literary productions, but in its geometry.

The story of the lucky child with the fatal letter has now been told—far more fully than my rude abstract can give any conception of—and our author pauses to prove that the Urias story (given in the Hebrew) and those of Bellerophon, Kai Chosrau (in Persian) and Core mac Lugdach (in Irish), in spite of points of resemblance, do not belong to the Hamlet saga.

A last section of Additions and Corrections which have accrued of late years, contains a Chinese story of about A.D. 250-280 and much more that shows Professor Schick the unsuspected magnitude of the task he set himself more than twenty years ago.

But no other man would have had either the courage or astounding ability to undertake it and we must wish him many more years of life and vigour to bring it to a conclusion.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

A Poetical Rhapsody, 1602-21. Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1931-2. 2 vols. viii + 364 and xii + 332 pp. 24s. 6d. each.

These two pleasantly produced volumes will prove as necessary to the student of Elizabethan lyric as all those other volumes already edited by Professor Rollins. Vol. I reprints in quasi-facsimile the last of the great Elizabethan miscellanies. Vol. II is made up of introduction,

plentiful notes and a useful index of names, subjects and words. Fortunately Professor Rollins has had the use of Dr A. S. W. Rosenbach's copy of the first edition of 1602, a copy unique in being almost perfect. All previous editors of the *Poetical Rhapsody* have used the Bodleian copy which lacks eight leaves and has had its text impaired in places by too close trimming. 'My edition,' says Professor Rollins, 'is the only one issued since 1602 that follows [the first edition] in every detail.' Actually the wording of that forgot the inevitable law that such accuracy is impossible. Professor Rollins in his second volume notes some errors escaped. There seems to be another to add: 'saining' apparently should have been 'fainng' at i, 274, l. 16.

Almost the only problem which an editor of the *Poetical Rhapsody* has to face is the problem of 'A. W.' In his preface to the first edition Francis Davison, the compiler and part author, speaks with what appears to be rather naive mystification about 'my deare friend *Anomos*,' and, while giving specific biographical detail about himself and his brother Walter, divulges only the emptiest generalities about *Anomos*. In the text of the second edition (1608) the name *Anomos* is dropped, and in the preface it is indefinitely multiplied into 'my dear friends *Anonymoi*.' Since all but one of the poems which are added to this edition are signed by name or initials, and since the one exception is a poem by Sir Walter Raleigh, it seems that Davison is playing with what he pretended were his facts and so confessing them his fancies. And, further, in Davison's MS. list of poems (preserved in the British Museum), the 'A. W.' is made to cover two poems the authorship of which is almost certainly Sidney's. These two poems open the *Poetical Rhapsody* and are autobiographically assignable to Sidney, both being addressed to '*his two worthy Friends and fellow-Poets, Sir Edward Dier, and Maister Fulke Grevill.*' Davison has something to say on the signing of the poems with Sidney's name and the placing of them first in the volume:

'I vtterly disclaime it, as being done by the Printer, either to grace the forefront with Sir *Ph.* Sidneyes...name, or to make the booke grow to a competent volume.'

Davison did not intend to include those poems, it seems. And yet they are both included in his MS. list and signed 'A. W.' As an ascriber of poems, then, Davison is so poor that John Bailey, his printer, can put him right. It follows that since the poems assigned in the MS. list to 'A. W.' are not all by the same poet, 'A. W.' must have been Davison's personal method for indicating work detached from its author. If 'A. W.' had been a real author, his poems would probably have been kept more closely from foreign invasion—though it must be remembered that they belong to a period twenty years before Davison published them, and that over so long a time apocryphal material can collect round a body of poetry. The evidence which points Professor Rollins to follow W. F. Linton in reading 'A. W.' as 'Anonymous Writer' might be fuller but is reasonably indicative—'Anonymous Writer' certainly sounds non-Elizabethan but is possible according to the *N.E.D.*

When the Bodleian index of first lines of MS. poems is completed, the

editor of such an anthology as this will have a more straightforward task. He will be able to trace all the appearances of every poem in all the privately compiled miscellanies in the Bodleian and in the British Museum (whose first-line index has been complete for some time) and to follow up any hints of authorship they afford. Professor Rollins may have done this as far as the Museum index took him, but he does not use any material from such sources in his introduction. It would be a help in dealing with the problem to know if many of the poems of 'A. W.' are assigned to known or named writers by contemporary collectors.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

The Early Lives of Milton. Edited with Introduction and Notes by HELEN DARBISHIRE. London: Constable, 1932. lxi + 353 pp. 18s.

The healthiest sign in recent work on Milton, which Milton himself might have approved, is the resolve to get back to the 'primitive simplicity' of original sources and so be rid of the errors and corruptions, the 'superstitions' which inhere in all traditions. In this movement Miss Darbishire has performed two notable services, first by her edition of the manuscript of *Paradise Lost* and now by this excellent reprint of the early Lives. Both works were badly needed and long overdue, but they have at last fallen into good hands. In general commendation of the present volume it will suffice to say that the editor's work has been done as admirably as in the previous case, and to leave the one to compliment the other. I have noticed one misprint (*libertinisin*, p. 243); my own initials are wrongly given (p. xlii); rather more serious, the editor has overlooked Richardson's long list of *errata*, seven of which come into the Life.

The one point to be clear about—and it cannot be too much insisted on—is that three of these Lives are the original sources from which all others chiefly derive. Besides being the authorities for most of the facts of Milton's life they provide the only first-hand accounts of the kind of man he was. These three are by Aubrey, by an anonymous author, and by Edward Phillips; and the most important part of Miss Darbishire's interesting Introduction has to do with the authenticity of the former two. First, as already announced in her edition of the manuscript of *Paradise Lost*, she identifies the author of the anonymous Life with Milton's younger nephew, John Phillips; secondly, she vindicates Aubrey as a reliable witness. On the first point she argues from the similarity between the handwriting of the Life and that of the manuscript in the Bodleian of the Dedication to John Phillips's *Satyr against Hypocrites*, each of which appears from the alterations and additions to have been penned by its author. This identification is supported by the fact that in both manuscripts occurs Milton's peculiar spelling *thir*. Was this spelling adopted by only one of Milton's associates? In the Trinity manuscript at any rate it is only found, apart from examples in Milton's hand, in the second of the two sonnets to Cyriack Skinner; and Miss

Darbishire claims that these sonnets are 'written indubitably by the same hand that wrote the anonymous Life.' She admits that 'the handwriting of the sonnets is much more evidently like that of the anonymous Life than either is like the handwriting of the Dedication to the *Satyr against Hypocrites*' So far as the two latter manuscripts are concerned this can be explained by a natural change in handwriting during the thirty years between the *Satyr* (1654) and the Life (1686); but the sonnets were composed about 1655 and the hand here might therefore be expected to resemble that of the *Satyr* rather than that of the Life. Miss Darbishire seeks to get over this difficulty by arguing in a circle: if her identification of all three hands is correct, then the sonnets were copied out 'clearly, it seems, for the edition of poems to be published in 1673.' But she omits to note that the second of them, with which she is particularly concerned, was withheld by Milton from publication in 1673. This is the weakest link in her chain of evidence and one regrets that she has not set out the facts quite clearly and fairly. However she herself is convinced 'after prolonged study over a period of years' that the same hand wrote all three manuscripts; and we shall be justified for the present in relying on her judgment.

About her vindication of Aubrey there can be no question whatever. His *Collections* are here printed with remarkable skill so as to show the form and order in which they were jotted down; and this, as the editor claims, suffices to prove the zeal and methodical care with which Aubrey went to work to obtain and test his information. His procedure was first to sketch out the Life from facts and impressions derived from Milton himself, leaving gaps for further details he hoped to get; he then went to Milton's brother and widow for what they could tell him; and then, possibly at the latter's suggestion, to Edward Phillips, who wrote out part of his account with his own hand. Nor did Aubrey act in all this as the 'maggotie headed' gossip Anthony Wood has led us to suppose him, greedy and credulous of all he could hear, he was at pains to sift and compare and test his information. Thus a visit to Milton's apothecary enabled him to correct his first statement of the circumstances and date of Milton's death. Throughout these notes the frequent deletions and corrections, with the careful citation of authorities, tell the same tale of one who had 'a passion for facts.'

The importance of these two points is obvious. Hitherto there has been a tendency to put Edward Phillips's authority above the others, on account of his long and close association with his uncle: we can now accept all three as authentic witnesses who knew Milton and his circle intimately. The gist of their unanimous testimony as to the kind of man Milton was may be given in the similar testimony of Deborah Milton, as reported by Jonathan Richardson: 'He was delightful company, the life of the conversation, and that on account of a flow of subject, and an unaffected cheerfulness and civility.' Here is the man our biographers knew; yet we have suffered this intimate portrait to be replaced by the now familiar one of the pedagogue, puritan and republican, accepting the implication that our poet was a mere fanatic, a

doctrinaire, a party man. This apocryphal interpretation of his character is expressly denied by the first biographers and contradicted by his whole history: it is indeed a cruel paradox that he of all others should be thought of as enslaved and corrupted by that kind of blind zealotry he spent his life fighting without fear or favour.

It is a clear and credible portrait that emerges from this unanimous testimony. This surely was the man who during the last twenty years of his life was 'visited much (more than he did desire)' by eminent foreigners as well as by men of wit and learning at home. And there is evidence enough that after his death the world—at any rate the polite world—was ready to accept some such sympathetic portrait. Englishmen were proud of the poet who had outgone Homer and Virgil, and not without pride in the pamphleteer and latinist who vanquished Salmasius. On the other hand of course the 'late troubles' were not yet out of mind and there were many ready to join in execrating Milton as a pestilent sectarian and notorious rebel. Our three biographers show themselves aware of this hostile section of the public and are anxious to conciliate or silence it; I think they might have succeeded well enough, had their accounts been fairly presented to the world. Unfortunately the *Lives* by Aubrey and John Phillips came into the hands of Anthony Wood who used them to present the Tory view of Milton in the first *Life* to be published (1691). Edward Phillips's *Life*, published anonymously in 1694, was not attended to until Birch wrote in 1738; in the meantime it had been used by Toland whose *Life* (1698) probably did more than Wood's to stimulate the political and religious prejudice from which Milton's memory was to suffer. In effect Wood's and Toland's superseded the authentic *Lives*, and the false traditional view of Milton's character and personality is due to them.

Wood's *Life*, except for a few additional facts, is drawn entirely from Aubrey and John Phillips, about one-half being taken *verbatim* from the latter: yet he has no difficulty in giving a very different impression of Milton's personality. This is done by insisting at every point on Milton's pernicious opinions and political activities, altering to a contrary sense what his authorities say of Milton's disinterested motives, and suppressing what they say of his generosity and social charm. He omits, for example, the first part of the passage in which Aubrey tells of Milton's cheerful demeanour and free and delightful talk, stating only that he was 'of a very sharp, biting and satyrical wit.' In short here is the original portrait of Milton as the malignant, unscrupulous, truculent Puritan; and we see what authority it has.

The impression made by this first published *Life* was only confirmed by Toland, though he wrote as an ardent admirer of Milton. He admired Milton chiefly as the champion of freedom and freedom of thought; accordingly he emphasised, like Wood, what was for many the obnoxious side of Milton's life. True, he does not, like Wood, ignore the poet; but he judges that it was the chief design of *Paradise Lost* 'to display the different effects of liberty and tyranny.' Such advocacy, and from such an advocate, could only do harm to Milton's reputation. Toland, as a

free-thinker and deist, was at the moment the abomination of the orthodox. His book *Christianity Not Mystrious*, published two years before, is described by Leslie Stephen as 'the first act in the warfare between deists and the orthodox which was to occupy the next generation'; it raised an outcry and was presented by the grand jury of Middlesex. Milton's name was now associated with this controversy, and all the more closely on account of a chance remark in the *Life*. In attributing the *Icon Basilike* to Gauden, Toland had observed that the belief in Charles I's authorship made intelligible the admission in early times of so many supposititious pieces under the name of Christ and his apostles. This was taken to refer to the canonical gospels and an obscure rector, Offspring Blackall, took up the deistical challenge; Toland replied in *Amyntor or A Defence of Milton's Life* (1699). Milton's name was now out of the frying pan into the fire. I find it hard to forgive Toland, and certainly cannot agree with Miss Darbishire's wholehearted admiration for his *Life*: 'He lets in a larger and freer air by quoting fully from Milton's prose and verse—he sets out indeed, for the first time, the great passages of self-revelation.... His sketch of Milton's character and personal life is truer and fuller than any that went before, except that of John Phillips.' The larger and freer air Toland let in was too much like a storm. It is not that in the main he misrepresents Milton's political and religious opinions nor that these are other than essential in Milton's life; but as a biographer he had no right to sponsor those opinions or to extend them, as he repeatedly does, to the conditions and controversies of his own day. In doing this he confused not merely Milton's principles but Milton's personality with his own. The truth is that Toland was not, like the first biographers, sufficiently humble to present a bigger man than himself; he rides a cock-horse on Milton, using him, however honourably, in a cause. What one most objects to in him, as John Locke did, is his indiscretion and 'his exceeding great value of himself.'

There are other complaints against him. For his main narrative he followed Edward Phillips almost as closely as Wood had followed Aubrey and John Phillips; yet the only acknowledgment he makes is to say, 'I perus'd the Papers of one of his Nephews.' In point of fact he must have known Phillips's *Life* in its published form, since he refers to the *Letters of State* in which it appeared and reprints those letters in the prose works. Edward Phillips being dead, there would seem to have been no reason for not disclosing the authorship. It is true that he did not garble his authority as Wood had garbled his; but he was responsible for inserting the date 1643 into Phillips's account of the first marriage, which has done so much harm to Milton's memory. Miss Darbishire glosses over this fault by stating, inaccurately, that later biographers assumed that Phillips meant to date the marriage in the same year as Reading fell to the Earl of Essex; as I have pointed out (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, October, 1931), Toland does not mention this event, Birch is the first to connect it with Toland's date for the marriage, and it only became the real ground for continuing to accept that date after Masson had discovered the true date of the first divorce pamphlet.

Wood and Toland have never really been deposed as Milton's original biographers. They had incorporated the greater part of their sources almost word for word; therefore, even when these became independently known, they made no fresh or proper impression but were read under the influence of Wood and Toland. This is illustrated by the way Toland's date for the marriage continued to be read into Edward Phillips's narrative; it is equally illustrated by the acquiescence in Wood's rendering of what he was told by his authorities. Even with the evidence before us it requires no mean effort of imaginative scholarship to get behind the tradition of two centuries. In this task, however, we may have the help of Jonathan Richardson, whose *Life Miss Darbishire* rightly includes in her volume. Born in 1665, Richardson had grown up in a generation of men who had seen or known Milton, the generation to which the original biographers had addressed themselves. He wrote his *Life* knowing only the *Lives* by Wood and Toland, yet it represents exactly that sympathetic and admiring interest in a great poet to which the original biographers had hoped to appeal; and his portrait of the man is strikingly like theirs. Here in fact we meet again with that personal and more trustworthy tradition which Wood had fouled. This is the *Life* that I should praise in the terms Miss Darbishire applies to Toland's. Like Toland he quotes freely from the autobiographical passages in Milton's works, but not like Toland chiefly with reference to his political and religious opinions; he also illustrates, and equally fully, Milton's mind and character, his education, his poetic ambitions, tastes and methods. On Milton the controversialist and politician he is more conciliatory and wiser than Toland. 'I am not justifying his principles,' he says, 'but his sincerity'; yet the principles are revealed clearly and firmly, without further apology. Besides being more complete the portrait is more intimate, affectionate and personal than Toland's; we find ourselves reading about a person, not merely a public character.

Apart from the excellence of the *Life* in its general tone and proportions there are many particular points that call for commendation. Richardson is the first of the biographers, for instance, to be aware of discrepancies in the dates of the published accounts; and he deals admirably with the charge that Milton ill-treated his daughters, which is the only evidence in the original biographies for 'a harsh and cholerick' Milton. But the other outstanding merit of his book is that he is the first, and almost the last, to state the textual case of *Paradise Lost* properly. He tells the story of the different issues of the first edition, which had previously led to confusion about the date of publication, and gives a careful and clear account of their variations. He musters the evidence that Milton, despite his blindness, had both the will and the means to get his poem correctly printed. He insists on the importance of the spelling and pointing, over which Milton took such care, as guides to the reading of the poem. Lastly he recognises that 'the only authentic edition' of *Paradise Lost* is the second edition of 1674: 'By much comparing one (copy) with another, as we have had occasion, and by very often reading over that second edition (for that we have made our

standard book, undoubtedly we ought) we have found it had no new faults to make an errata necessary, a word or two, and perhaps here and there, rarely, a point. So that agreeing so nearly with the first edition, and that having been so thoroughly sifted for faults and corrected, we have reason to assure ourselves, especially if we take both these authentic editions together, that we are in possession of the genuine work of the author as much as in any printed book whatsoever.

No one took much stock of Richardson; his book in fact excited some derision, chiefly on account of the naive references to his son's collaboration. The game of improving Milton's text, which Richardson notes to have begun in the first edition after Milton's death, went on; it is only now that we are coming round to his view that *Paradise Lost* was printed exactly as Milton wished, that he knew what he was about, and that there is much risked and nothing gained by tampering with his text at all. Now also perhaps Richardson's attempt to revive the true portrait of Milton stands a better chance of being appreciated and he may be given his right place among the biographers, after Aubrey and the Phillipses. These four are our genuine biographers, and no unattested word on Milton that disagrees with theirs should henceforth be treated with respect.

B. A. WRIGHT.

GLASGOW.

The Songs of Dryden. Edited by CYRUS LAWRENCE DAY. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1932. xvi + 199 pp. 14s.

In the introduction to his *Seventeenth Century Lyrics* Mr Norman Ault notes the pre-eminent favour enjoyed in their day by the songs of Dryden. If we miss something in him which we find in Herrick, Carew, Suckling, Dorset, Rochester, his contemporaries were justified in their belief that 'all was Harmony when *Dryden* sung' As Verrall observed, 'the songs in the plays...show his admirable ear; he wrote simple rhythms with a new perfection' (*Lectures on Dryden*, p. 4).

Dryden's fine sense of vocabulary and gift of turned phrase none will question. These qualities scarcely vary from the youthful lyrics to the songs of his old age, and they are the measure of his attainment. In drama and in song he stands outside his subject; and, despite perfection of phrase, his verse seldom catches fire. The steady and consistent level upon which he wrote excites doubts. Mr Day, who has edited this collection most admirably, uses the word 'haunting' of the early 'Ah fading joy.' If we accept the word it must be with the qualification that this song is not quite of a piece with the later lyrics, looking back as it does to the Caroline poets. And, when all has been said, it has to be admitted that Dryden's lyrics are not among those which return again and again to haunt the memory.

On the other side of the matter Mr Day's scholarly and attractive volume serves to exemplify, and to emphasise again, the wide range and high level of Dryden as a writer of song. Mr Day has gathered into one

book all those compositions which Dryden intended should be sung to music. If we set aside some doubtful pieces, the variety of his achievement and his unfailing sureness cannot fail to impress. From the finely turned 'I feed a flame' to the long, and deservedly, popular 'Ah how sweet is love,' the charming 'Wherever I am, and whatever I doe,' the easy turn of the 'Epithalamium' from *Amboyna*, the splendid cadence of 'From the low Palace of old Father Ocean,' to the harvest song, 'Your Hay is Mow'd,' and so through the gamut to 'Alexander's Feast,' and the paraphrase of *Veni creator Spiritus*, Dryden reveals an astonishing ease and readiness of accomplishment.

If this volume, in which all Dryden's songs are for the first time brought together, had no further purpose than to exhibit their sequence and variety, it would have served an end. But Mr Day has done much more. He gives facsimile reproductions of as many of the original airs as he has been able to recover, whether printed or in manuscript, except some of the longer musical scores, including Purcell's settings, the last, of course, readily available elsewhere; and in his notes further pursues the musical history of the lyrics scattered throughout the plays. That they were written to be sung to musical accompaniments is often forgotten by the modern reader; and their hold upon the popular fancy of the day is more easily evident with the help of the facsimiles provided by Mr Day.

The canon of Dryden's lyrics is defined within narrow limits. The number of which the authenticity may be questioned is not large. It is impossible to assign with certainty songs contained in those plays which were written in collaboration. Into this class fall songs from *The Indian Queen* in which Sir Robert Howard had a part; songs from *The Tempest* in which Davenant collaborated; and songs from *Ædipus* of which Lee was joint author. Mr Day prints the lyrics from these plays with an acknowledged doubt; and with great hesitation one song, 'What shall I do to show how much I love her?' from *The Prophetess*, admitting the strong claim of Betterton, and more than a suspicion that Dryden had no part in the authorship. Lastly there is the long disputed 'Farewel, fair *Armeda*,' accepted as Dryden's by Malone and Scott, and uncompromisingly rejected by Thorn-Drury. Mr Day reviews the evidence for and against in a well-argued note, in which he puts forward one or two additional suggestions in favour of Dryden, refusing to accept Thorn-Drury's judgment as final.

The words accompanying the facsimiles show variants, rearrangements, or amplifications of the text as printed by Mr Day. Composers adapted what Dryden wrote; song-books and miscellany collections, if we follow them through, show other and succeeding changes. Mr Day ignores these unauthorised variations, printing his text, with an exact accuracy, from the first editions of plays or miscellanies. Later alterations, even if they can make no claim to come from Dryden's hand, are not without their interest as indications of contemporary taste, and perhaps one short-coming of Mr Day's admirable notes is the slight attention they receive. For his claim in the introduction that the notes present 'a certain amount

of previously inaccessible information' is a modest under-statement. His editorial work is most thorough and scholarly. He traces through poetical miscellanies and song-books the history of the words and airs. He notes the appearance of spurious additional stanzas, expansions in ballad form, imitations, and parodies. And, whenever he has unearthed a reference, he gives the dates of special musical performances.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

ASPENDEN, HERTS.

Thomas Southerne, Dramatist. By JOHN WENDELL DODDS. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. (Yale Studies in English, LXXXI.) 1933. 237 pp. 12s.

Thomas Southerne, after years of neglect, has suddenly become fashionable. *Oroonoko* was revived at the Malvern Festival in 1932; no less than four post-graduate dissertations have been devoted to this author's 'life and works'; and now Dr J. W. Dodds comes forward with an excellent survey of his career.

For the biographer, Southerne does not, in spite of the long span of his days, provide very happy hunting ground. From 1660, when he was born, to 1745, when he died, he seems to have pursued an even, placid course, carefully amassing wealth where his fellow-dramatists carelessly spent it, refusing to be drawn into those many escapades which, if often vulgar, add richness and variety to the lives of others. It is, therefore, not surprising that Dr Dodds's 'Biographical Sketch' (which includes nearly all the relevant material) extends to only 27 pages out of a total of 217. There was nothing more to say; and it seems unlikely that many important documents will be unearthed relating to this worthy, but unexciting, gentleman.

Dr Dodds, therefore, devotes, and rightly devotes, the major part of his book to an analysis of Southerne's dramatic work. Here he has made some definite contributions to knowledge, particularly with reference to the exact dating of the plays; but the worth of his survey lies, not in its facts, but in the able presentation of the dramatist's aims and in the critical appreciation of his historical position. The analysis of Southerne's contributions to the sentimental cult is excellently done; therein Dr Dodds not only indicates the intrinsic merit of the plays but aids in the interpretation of the sentimental movement as a whole. His critical equipment is good and he has the power of seizing boldly on fundamental issues; these qualities are well displayed in his skilful comparison of *Oroonoko* and Mrs Behn's original story. Dr Dodds's final judgment, in which he stresses the essentially theatrical treatment given by Southerne to the plot, was amply substantiated in practice last year at Malvern; the heroic mood mingled with sentimental pathos carried the play and made its revival memorable in spite of all the foolish artificialities in the dialogue.

Dr Dodds has left a reviewer little to correct. Like him, I cannot trace the 1719 edition of *The Fatal Marriage*, an announcement of which he finds on the title-page of *The Spartan Dame*; it may be noted, however,

that this 'new and corrected' edition is advertised as published in *The Daily Post* for December 12, 1719. To the analogues of *The Fatal Marriage* might be added T. J. Haines's *My Poll and My Partner Joe*, a melodrama the story of which was related to that of Southerne's play in *The Athenæum* for October 10, 1857. Perhaps, too, a word or two should have been devoted to that article 'On the Poets and Actors in King Charles II's Reign' which appeared in *The Gentleman's Magazine* early in 1745. There has been a tendency lately to deny that Malone's attribution of this to Southerne has any validity: but some fresh arguments in favour of Southerne's authorship have lately been published by Clifford Leech in *Notes and Queries* (June 10, 1933). If, indeed, it was written by the dramatist, it provides an interesting commentary on his decaying mind, full of wandering and often erroneous memories.

ALLARDYCE NICOLL.

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT.

Warburton and the Warburtonians. By A. W. EVANS. Oxford: University Press. 1932. viii + 315 pp. 15s.

Of William Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester, editor of Pope and Shakespeare, author of *The Divine Legation of Moses* and of some thirty other works both large and small, it must be difficult to write any reasonably short life that does not seem a mere summary. He was concerned in so many literary and theological controversies, and his interests were so miscellaneous, that it must be hard for his biographer to avoid a certain disconnectedness in his treatment of such varied material. If Mr Evans's book is not free from this fault, he has written a much better biography of Warburton than that of J. Selby Watson, published as far back as 1863. Watson made the mistake of writing about a man he was determined not to like, and the sneering attitude which he too frequently adopted prevented him from doing justice to his subject. Mr Evans does not come to Warburton as a hero-worshipper, but with a respectful curiosity, and with a willingness to discover the reasons for his great reputation in the eighteenth century. The result is not a great biography, but a useful introduction to Warburton's varied career.

Mr Evans naturally devotes much of his space to Warburton's quarrels, and adds a useful bibliography of the controversial literature which they occasioned. Those controversies are, in fact, the key to his literary character. He was one of those writers whose inspiration comes mainly from disagreement; he needed something or someone to quarrel with before he could bring his extensive and curious learning into play. He was one of those who must take sides; his talent was for the vigorous presentation of a case, and the unsparing discomfiture of those rash souls who criticised him. It is in such literary activity that the best and the worst of Warburton appear: the best in the full-blooded zest with which he makes mammoths of his opponents, the worst, in that 'shallow and unsympathetic reasoning,' that 'controversial and acrimonious dispute' which Mr Evans in a paragraph of admirable criticism on *The Divine*

Legation (p. 64) notes as one characteristic of the whole century. While doing justice to Warburton on so many other counts, Mr Evans might have put in a word for his literary style, which was undervalued by his contemporaries because it departed frequently from the calm and decent periods to which they were accustomed. Johnson, for instance, found Warburton's diction coarse and impure, and his sentences unmeasured; Mr Evans contents himself with suggesting that this was not always so. It is possible, however, that the twentieth century will value Warburton's diction for what the eighteenth considered to be its faults. His prose, blotchy and coarse though it may often be, is a most rash and interesting outbreak in the mid-eighteenth century; and it is time some critic did justice to its vigour, and pointed out that Warburton, for all his violent and intolerant thinking, is in prose an eighteenth-century son of Milton. Mr Evans has let slip this opportunity; but if the tide does at last turn in favour of Warburton this honest and impartial study will be entitled to much of the credit.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

LONDON.

English Burlesque Poetry, 1700-1750. By RICHMOND P. BOND. (Harvard Studies in English, VI.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1932. xiii + 483 pp. 20s.

Mr Bond's period covers the great age of English burlesque in poetry, but the incubation period was the Restoration age when as good wily Bishop Burnet said 'Cant grew diverting.' Renaissance writers used allegory when they wanted to convey censure, the wits of Swift's time used the sneer or the burlesque. The result is more diverting than edifying, and as a matter of fact the diversion is more limited than the vast mass of mocking pasquils seems to promise. Half a dozen masterpieces headed by *The Rape of the Lock*, and a hundred or two tedious or dirty pieces, such is the literary yield of the grand age of mockery and insult! Hence the snag in the path of the faithful recorder of burlesque poetry in the first half of the eighteenth century. How he must warm to the half a dozen masterpieces! How his stomach must turn as he exhumes the remains of the stupid imitators!

Mr Bond has not winced or cried aloud. He has completed the task and here in his Register of 218 pages we have the inclusive catalogue raisonné of the whole tribe of mock poems. We are glad to have it once for all and so competently done. 'The obligation of *The Hoop-Petticoat* (which must not be confused with a poem by "Joseph Gay" which in the third edition had the same title; see no. 48) to *The Rape of the Lock* is obvious.' It is painfully obvious, but hardly so obvious as Mr Bond's difficulty as a sensible man in reconciling all this with the true business of scholarship. Still, if it must be done, let us have Registrars like Mr Bond. His resource and fidelity never flag through these difficult pages.

The Register is half the book in bulk. But the text itself is not free from the author's weakness for listing all the imitations which every

lively burlesque spawned. For example, on p. 170 Mr Bond is not content with noting that Henry Carey's *Namby-Pamby* is, with perhaps Browne's imitation in *A Pipe of Tobacco*, the only good parody of Ambrose Philips's childish style. The page breaks into a rash of all the paltry imitations. And this is typical of the book throughout. I ascribe this to the inexperience which has not learned the art of tucking away inconvenient matter in inconspicuous places, rather than to gross lack of perspective. Mr Bond shows throughout that he can assess the value of those tedious pieces quite well though his system makes him pay them the compliment of serious treatment.

The most valuable chapter in the book is, I think, that entitled 'The Critical Theory of Burlesque in the 18th century' (Chap. II). Mr Bond has here gathered from all sources the views of the wits on the subject over the greater part of the century. It is a distinct contribution to literary criticism—on a minor mode truly, but a mode which invaded nearly every field of eighteenth-century letters. One only criticism I make here. Mr Bond has failed to connect the purely literary matter with the public debate outside as to the reasonableness of the burlesque manner. He might have shown how pulpit and press were excited over the question of the validity of burlesque or banter as a means of discovering truth. He might have shown how the Church descended to the use of ridicule as a means of defence against subversive doctrines and how as a result the humorous offensive passed into the hands of the Church and State party,—where it remains to this day.

The very long discussion on *The Rape of the Lock* I confess I found tedious, and yet *The Rape* was a main test for Mr Bond's critical discernment. Again I remark, he does not lack discernment, but he has allowed his chapter on this poem to be cluttered up with quotation from every stupid as well as every relevant analysis of its burlesque features. Still what he here brings to light will be useful for reference, especially to the teacher or lecturer.

Faults of style are not wanting, but they do not hurt much. The arrangement is satisfactory though I cannot understand why treatment of Vida's *La Secchia Rapita* could not have been made preparatory to *The Rape of the Lock* instead of lagging a hundred pages behind it.

GEORGE KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

Bischof Percys Bearbeitung der Volksballaden und Kunstgedichte seines Folio-Manuskriptes. Von MARGARETE WILLINSKY. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1932. 227 pp. 10 M.

By comparing the poems in the folio manuscript with those in the *Reliques*, the author has shown the extent and the nature of the concessions made by Percy to the taste of his age. Occasionally, it would have been valuable to compare the versions in the Pepys collection, because in some cases Percy was influenced by them. Unfortunately Professor Rollins's edition of the Pepys ballads has not been accessible to Dr Willinsky. One can sympathise with her difficulties in this con-

nexion, but when, as on pp. 61 and 97, she makes statements about the Pepys ballads without having seen them, her procedure is clearly unsound in principle. In some instances, objection may also be taken to her bibliography for its lack of precision and on p. 23 the reference to the various 'Garlands' is open to similar criticism. Misprints occur in quotations on pp. 27, 28, 29, 32, 66, and 131 note, but these, though disturbing, are minor matters.

A more serious ground for criticism is the excessive length of the two introductory chapters. The first attempts to describe the chief tendencies in eighteenth century literature and the second, after a survey of early ballad collections, gives an account of the genesis of Percy's *Reliques*, based mainly on Professor Hecht's edition of the correspondence between Percy and Shenstone. It was surely not necessary to devote thirty-nine pages to such derivative matter. The subsequent discussion of the *Reliques* is painstaking and, in places, suggestive. One must regret, however, that the author's somewhat mechanical treatment of ballad after ballad in the same manner leaves her too little scope, especially where Percy kept more closely to the folio manuscript, so that an impression of monotony is created. Nevertheless, this book contains much useful material and the summary, at the close, of Percy's attitude to the ballads is not uninformative. But does the author really think that a moralising tendency is a sign of romanticism?

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

La Poesia di Shelley. Da MICHELE RENZULLI. Foligno: Franco Campitelli. 1932. 448 pp. L. 20.

The author, who is a professor at Temple University, Philadelphia, in his preface gives a survey of translations and studies of Shelley which have been published in Italy. He refuses to be classed with any particular group of Italian critics, whether the impressionist school of Papini, which he frankly despises, or the philosophical school of Croce, which he greatly admires. Without preconceived theories, he tells us, he seeks to analyse Shelley with the Olympian serenity of a surgeon operating on a body.

In so doing, Professor Renzulli attempts, with considerable success, to trace an evolution in Shelley, and this aim lends unity to the book. He writes with lucidity and vigour and even Shelley specialists will be able to learn something from him. His comparisons of Shelley with Leopardi, Carducci and Dante are often suggestive and his studies of the horrible in Shelley, of his Hellenism, of *The Cenci*, and of *Prometheus Unbound*, to take but a few examples, give food for thought. Professor Renzulli is especially sensitive to the beauty and melody of Shelley, in whom he sees above all a great musician. On the other hand, he has no sympathy with Shelley's ideas. The poet seems to him lacking in depth, robustness, and coherence—one who merely rearranged the thoughts of others, more particularly those of Godwin, under whose influence he falls into declamation, didacticism, oratorical verbosity and vacuity. Hence the 'complete

anarchy' of *Prometheus Unbound* appears in Professor Renzulli's eyes 'a heap of absurdities.' In this direction Professor Renzulli does Shelley less than justice.

Intimate as Professor Renzulli is with Shelley, he seems to be less familiar with Keats, otherwise he would not have drawn the traditional contrast, so pleasingly neat, and yet so untrue, between Shelley the reformer, and Keats, the pure artist, the lover of art for art's sake, completely devoid of interest in mankind and ignorant of human grief. Nor is it true to say that Keats sees nothing in Nature but beauty and is unaware of its struggles and cruelty. The *Epistle to John Hamilton Reynolds* is clear proof of the contrary.

However, it is abundantly evident that Professor Renzulli is well versed in the main theme of his book. He has all the resources of American libraries at his back and he has made good use of them. But at times he betrays a regrettable asperity towards others less thorough in their knowledge than himself. It is unfortunate that he lets himself be tempted to forget the serenity of temper which he advocates in his preface. Thus Giuseppe Chiarini is called a parrot (pp. 173, 174 and 178) and Zacchetti is also roundly abused (pp. 350-1). In the same way the reader notes with some surprise the reference to 'so many worthy people who have preceded me' (p. 153) and to 'the foolish criticisms of Clutton-Brock and Co.' (p. 162).

On yet another score objection may be taken to Professor Renzulli's book. It is inaccurate, not in its information, but in the reproduction of sources. Instances are the letters quoted from Dowden on pp. 309-10 and 317-18, and from John Murray's *Lord Byron's Correspondence* on pp. 331-2 and 349, while the extract from Koszul's *La Jeunesse de Shelley* on pp. 109-10 is so garbled as to be unintelligible. Misprints of non-Italian names are common. Here are some examples. Bysshe, the poet's second name, appears practically everywhere as Bisshe, Elizabeth Hitchener as Hitchner, and Sir William Jones as Jone. Other errors are Nantguillt, Tannyrallt (p. 122), Miss O'Neil (p. 181), Helene Ritcher (pp. 207 and 438), Cluton Brock (p. 207), Swinburne's *Va Ave atque Vale* (p. 272), Hookman (i.e., Hookham) (p. 306), Clifton (p. 309), Sir Rennel Rod (p. 415), George M. Brandes (p. 420), Brandl, Samuel T. (instead of Alois) (p. 420), de Quincy (p. 425), Diblin (i.e. Dibdin) (p. 425), Beaconfield (p. 428), Brimly Johnson (p. 430), Liewelyn (p. 437), J. Campbell Sharp (p. 440), Edvard Thomas (p. 442), R. C. Treveleyan (p. 444).

The titles of German books are likewise badly mutilated, and even if these were corrected, more errors than space would allow us to point out here would still remain. The bibliographical appendix is also open to criticism, for it lacks system. Sometimes the Christian name of an author is given, sometimes not, and strict alphabetical order is not maintained.

It is a pity that a book so well informed and in many respects so attractive should be disfigured by these blemishes. Even as it is, it should occupy an important place in Italian literature about Shelley.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

Die Alpen in der englischen Literatur und Kunst. Von ROBERT SPINDLER. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXI.) Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1932. 31 pp. 2 M.

In this thesis Dr Robert Spindler surveys the influence of the Alps on English literature and art from the beginning to the present century. In tracing the development of his theme he concentrates, not unnaturally, on the eighteenth century. He finds in the late seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries a reaction, timid at first but later more confident, against the tastes which conform to regularity and orderliness: the love of the Alps, 'of wild Nature,' contributes to this freedom, which in turn helps to sustain the susceptibilities of romanticism. Much in Dr Spindler's argument is suggestive, yet there are some important omissions. He seems unaware of Milton's references in *Paradise Lost* and in *Samson Agonistes*. More serious is an absence of any discussion of Pope's use of the Alps and of mountain scenery. The passages in *An Essay on Criticism*, though this is not noted in 'Elwin and Court-hope,' are obviously indebted to Addison's Italian journey and to the description in Dennis's *Miscellanies*. The whole contact of 'sense' and 'sensitivity' in the early eighteenth century is more involved than Dr Spindler suggests. There are many indications that up to 1714 there was a latent but keen sense of romanticism in English poetry and taste: Gay, Dennis, Ambrose Philips, Addison and even Pope himself (see *An Essay on Criticism*, ll. 158 *et seq.*) were affected. That movement might have developed had not Pope despised Ambrose Philips and estranged himself from Addison, or had Gay had a greater independence of spirit. At the same time there was a dominant and respectable school of orderly taste, as can be seen in Evelyn's *Diary* from which Dr Spindler quotes. By 1714 Pope's allegiance is given, in its entirety, to the dominant school, but the conflict of tastes in the later seventeenth century and the early eighteenth are more elaborate than Dr Spindler would appear to allow.

B. IFOR EVANS.

SHEFFIELD.

The Old Woman: One Phase of the Character Poem in Contemporary British Verse. By SISTER MARIA KOSTKA, S.S.J. Philadelphia. 1931. 58 pp.

Italy in the Post-Victorian Novel. By HORACE TIPPIN BOILEAU. Philadelphia. 1931. xii + 130 pp.

The Ulster Theatre in Ireland. By MARGARET MCHENRY. Philadelphia. 1931. 110 pp.

The Sonnet in American Literature. By LEWIS G. STERNER. Philadelphia. 1930. xxii + 168 pp.

Representation and Misrepresentation of the Puritan in Elizabethan Drama. By AARON MICHAEL MYERS. Philadelphia. 1931. 152 pp.

Francis Lenton, Queen's Poet. By LEOTA SPRINGER WILLIS. Philadelphia. 1931. 98 pp.

These books may seem to be as incongruous an assemblage for a joint review as ever Southey made, but they have one thing in common: they are all theses accepted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Pennsylvania, and they serve to illustrate the difficulty which administrative and academic bodies find in deciding what is the value of a Ph.D. degree. For they are of very varying value.

The Old Woman is little more than a string of quotations with occasional comments. It was evidently compiled with enjoyment, but it does not indicate much scholarship. *Italy in the Post-Victorian Novel* shows the same enjoyment, but a more critical attitude towards the authors who are considered and whose works are summarised. There are one or two omissions from the collection, but it is almost complete, and Mr Boileau has grouped and generalised with some success. *The Ulster Theatre in Ireland* is a piece of detailed, perhaps too detailed, history, but it will undoubtedly be of value to later theatrical historians.

The Sonnet in American Literature is, on the other hand, a portentous thing, whose general effect is one of intolerable literariness on the part of the poets, with a few exceptions, and plodding industry, unrelieved by poetic insight, on the part of the author. Neither he nor anyone else can be the better for all the labour which went to the compilation of his tables alone: of the contribution of each of the 203 writers (of whom perhaps 10 per cent. deserve to be remembered) to the four classes of sonnets which he recognises; of the forms used by a limited number of American sonnet writers; of the number of sonnets written by these writers, and the percentage in each class; of all American writers of more than five sonnets who wrote exclusively in one form; of the relative preponderance of the forms; of 'all the sonnets the forms of which were analysed for consideration in this study'; and, as if these six were not enough, two final tables which 'merely restate the figures of the preceding table in different ways, in order to make still more clear the relation of the various sonnet forms to each other and to the total number of sonnets written.' This is the very ecstasy of scholarship.

Mr Myers has produced a readable book which shows sense and judgment, though we may question some of his statements and conclusions. Sir Oliver Martext (p. 32), was a hedge-priest, not a Puritan—for such fantastical knaves he had a strong dislike. There was never any probability of a return to Latin in congregational services (pp. 49 and 51). And there is evident, especially near the beginning and on p. 69, a struggle in the author's mind between the conventional view of history, which looks upon Puritanism as representing 'more liberal religious influences' and his own sense and observation, which perceives 'the intolerant, narrow type of mind predominant in the average Puritan group.' It is an interesting book in more ways than one.

Finally, Mrs Willis takes a restricted field, the study of an almost unknown writer, and shows that 'anagrammatist and small poet' to be, to the limit of his capacity, a mirror of his age. Oxford, Lincoln's Inn,

the Fleece Tavern, the Court, were his surroundings, and he produced exactly the kind of literature which might have been expected of a man of some graceful fancy and no real inspiration: the satire of *The Young Gallant's Whirligig*, verses of compliment, a poem founded on Scripture, and prose characters which are here reprinted. The study may be of small things, but they touch great ones, and that Mrs Willis has realised: she does not overestimate the actual value of Lenton's writings, but she brings out their significance. Of the six theses hers, in its modest way, and in spite of far too many misprints, is the most scholarly, and that of Mr Myers, in spite of an occasional error or disproportion, the most promising.

EDITH C. BATHO.

LONDON.

The Popular Novel in England 1770-1800. By J. M. S. TOMPKINS. Constable. 1932. xii + 388 pp. 12s 6d.

Die Vorgeschichte des historischen Romans in der modernen englischen Literatur. Von GERHARD BUCK. (*Britannica*, II.) Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter, and Co. 1931. 115 pp. 7 M.

W. M. Thackeray: l'homme, le penseur, le romancier. Par RAYMOND LAS VERGNAS. Paris: Champion. 1932. 410 pp. 60 fr.

Die Erzählkunst in Thackeray's 'Vanity Fair.' Von LUDWIG BAUCKE. (*Britannica*, IV.) Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter, and Co. 1932. xii + 187 pp. 8 M.

Die Philosophie Fieldings. Von MARIA JOESTEN. (*Kölner anglistische Arbeiten*, XV.) Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1932. 107 pp. 5 M.

George Gissing und die soziale Frage. Von ANTON WEBER. (*Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*, XX.) Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1932. 298 pp. 15 M.

The first and the third of these half-dozen works stand out from the ruck of doctoral theses, as showing considerable originality and literary charm, as well as learning. Dr Tompkins has succeeded in writing a most readable study of a large number of once popular novels that are with few exceptions unreadable now. As she observes in the preface, between the four great novelists of the mid-eighteenth century and Jane Austen and Scott 'there are no names which posterity has consented to call great'; though we must not ignore the authors of *The Vicar of Wakefield* and of *Evelina*. In short, those considered are definitely minor novels, and the majority have little historical interest, except as evidences of the prevailing taste of readers. And, according to the dust-cover furnished by the publishers, the subject is 'the essence of popular taste in novel-reading' at that epoch. This is not a critical examination of the novel, not a discussion of literary achievement, but 'a study of best-sellers,' and an attempt to account for the popularity of certain kinds of fiction. To say that Miss Tompkins has put herself at the contemporary point of view would be misleading; but she has made clear what were the likes and dislikes of readers, organised to some extent through the circulating libraries, and how singularly unintelligent were the views and prejudices of those

who reviewed novels in the *Monthly* and the *Critical Review*. Very amiably and indulgently, she has shown what the writers were trying to do; but she would probably deprecate the idea that she has contributed a chapter to the history of the novel.

Nevertheless, the historical situation, the available models, the changes of fashion and outlook, and the technical methods in vogue, could not be left out of account. As Miss Tompkins accurately observes, even the imitators failed 'to occupy effectively' the ground conquered by the novel under the four great masters. There were various unillustrious followers of Richardson and Fielding; few copied Smollett, except that the slipshod found it a line of least resistance to adopt his loose picaresque structure; the worthiest disciple of Sterne was Mackenzie, who rarely gets his due, as he does here. Dr Moore, author of that admirable novel *Zeluco*, perhaps gets more than his due; the scientific interest and the psychological acuteness of that book being a little exaggerated. But Miss Tompkins lets fall many admirable critical remarks, for instance, in summarising Sterne's revelation of 'the small and of the fleeting,' or in her account of Bage, Mrs Inchbald, and some much more obscure novelists; though it is rather a flagrant case of what the French call 'Messianisme' to write, 'We are on the threshold of a new era, and Dickens and Thackeray are casting their shadows before.'

Miss Tompkins unavoidably raises historical questions when she comes to Gothic romance and the novel of sentiment, in regard to both of which French influence is underrated. It was worth while to remind students that Gothic poetry came before Gothic fiction, at any rate, in England. But, although there is a perfunctory reference to Prévost and Madame d'Aulnoy, the part of both those writers, the first above all, in the genesis of Gothic romance is entirely overlooked. To speak of English and German romance-writers as 'equally the progeny of Otranto' is to subscribe to a time-honoured legend that ought now to be repudiated by academic criticism. There is an appendix on 'Mrs Radcliffe's sources'; but the original source, even if Mrs Radcliffe did not actually read his *Doyen de Killerine*, his *Cleveland*, and his *Mémoires d'un homme de qualité*, was the Abbé Prévost, whose novels were widely read in English translations long before the dilettante Walpole had a *succès d'estime* with his *Castle of Otranto*. Both Leland's *Longsword* and Walpole's *Otranto* have had a fictitious importance ascribed them through ignorance of Prévost. *The Recess*, by Sophia Lee, owes much more to Prévost than to Baculard d'Arnaud; though Baculard's influence on some other novelists might have received more acknowledgment. Miss Tompkins is good on the debt of Mrs Radcliffe and her imitators to Claude, Poussin (not 'the Poussins'), and other painters; but like most others she omits to notice that Thomas Amory, in *John Bunble*, gave excellent 'transcripts of English landscapes' as early as the 1750's.

Dr Buck's thesis is an intelligent and useful survey of the rise of the English historical novel; but is liable to similar criticism. Probably he did not enjoy access to all the necessary records of latest research.

As the monograph on Thackeray by Dr Las Vergnas appears to be the

first on the subject in French, there is an adequate reason for the fullness with which he has dealt with many aspects that are usually taken for granted and with some problems that have long been settled. His pages bristle with references and acknowledgments; the book is so well documented that what originality it contains tends to be dissembled. And Thackeray would have come out of it better for French readers had the tone of the book been less apologetic. As to the vulgar charge that the great novelist was a cynic, surely that need not have been so laboriously refuted. Bagehot long ago pointed out that he had an abnormally sensitive mind, like a woman's. Our author quotes part of Bagehot's explanation; and, in modern psychological style, insists on Thackeray's hypersensitiveness and almost morbid clear-sightedness. His 'cynisme'—note the different shade of meaning from that of the English 'cynicism'—was what Thackeray had to pay for his too lucid intelligence. 'Tête contre cœur, et voilà tout Thackeray.' His instinct was to idealise; his need was to love and be loved; but the realities which he saw so plainly were too much for him; hence his disillusionment, his bitterness, his alleged cynicism. We will not quarrel with our critic's plea.

Some small misunderstandings, however, may fairly be put down to the French point of view. Thackeray's reticence in certain situations, for instance, like Jane Austen's silences about love-crises and similar emotional events, was due to his thoroughly English and aristocratic reserve, rather than to a sensibility such that 'certaines grandes émotions de la vie paralysent sa plume.' And the latent 'romantisme' which the author continually discerns must be taken strictly in the French sense, and, even so, heavily discounted, in a writer who, admittedly, was the spiritual heir of Addison and Fielding, and who in his derision of Scott and scornful impatience for the excesses of Lytton, Lever, and others was as anti-romantic as you please. Is it true that Thackeray was the first to expose snobbery, at least in the moral sense? He was the first to apply the word, but the thing can be traced in the novels of Bage and Holcroft. Dr Las Vergnas is of opinion that the novelist was badly misled in his social criticism through his obsession with snobs. Here he is not far wrong. But it is rather amusing to be told that it was because of Borrow's anti-snobbery that he was accounted by Thackeray one of our most remarkable prose-writers.

To do the book justice, we should have to devote far more space than is at our disposal to the interesting and controversial third part, where Thackeray's brand of realism and the general characteristics of his art are fully analysed. This might well be read in conjunction with the next on our list, which deals with these aspects of *Vanity Fair*, from a typically German point of view. Unfortunately, this must be mentioned only to be dismissed, and so also the two works on Fielding and George Gissing. In the former of these, Fielding's debt to Socrates and the Stoics and also to Locke, receives adequate treatment; but has not Dr Joesten failed to appreciate the agreement between his conception of life and morals and that of Shaftesbury? The long and careful study of Gissing brings out the profound orientation of his novels towards a compassionate and indignant

protest against the social lot of the poor and disinherited. Gissing was no politician, and in his portrait of a socialist, in *Demos*, he was critical and detached; but no one has given more eloquent expression to the state of mind which has been the basis of English socialism, as distinguished from the more theoretic Continental form of the doctrine.

ERNEST A. BAKER.

LONDON.

The Issue in Literary Criticism. By MYRON F. BRIGHTFIELD. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1932. xiii + 316 pp. \$4.

Every literary critic regrets the lack of scientific exactitude in his methods and his findings. He may feel in his heart that man in his judgments about the beautiful must ever be guided by a personal and therefore fallible taste, yet he longs for a sure, impersonal standard. Hence arise all our systems of aesthetic, which, like the ivy, parasitic upon the ruling ideas or tendencies of the day or generation, fall into oblivion when the supporting structure crumbles. In his book *The Issue in Literary Criticism*, Professor Brightfield propounds a system which he claims is exact and objective. It is the conception of a scientific and, if you care for the term, a materialistic age, and is the result of the application of the philosophic outlook of pragmatism to the problem of beauty. Knowledge to a pragmatist is not knowledge unless it is arrived at by methods which permit any succeeding experimenter to review the steps, and verify the result. An individual may lay claim to any experience, but unless it is verifiable it is not knowledge.

Plato's 'idea' of beauty, or any 'occult influence' is therefore attacked strenuously. The book is, perhaps, a little marred by the caricature of idealism which it contains. Privilege has been attacked in religion and in politics, and what the idealist will term materialism is raising a formidable head in the hitherto inviolable land of poetry. It is difficult to describe briefly so far-flung a campaign, though one cannot fail to admire the orderly strategy of the attack as it is conducted in this book. Professor Brightfield claims for it no originality. It is merely an attempt to organise and co-ordinate the empiricist's views upon the beautiful. This is a term which is used to describe experiences in real life, as well as in the 'fictional' field of art. Accordingly, after a statement of the pragmatist's philosophic position, he moves forward on a gradually limiting front, through class and sub-class till he arrives at the beautiful in literature. Man finds himself in an environment against which he is continually struggling in order to force it to conform to his desires. The lack of conformity between his desires and his experience makes him seek out those elements which promise some measure of success for his designs. These constitute the beautiful. "Beautiful" is a term applied by a man to an object (or situation) to indicate that the object (or situation) is in the state in which he wishes it to be—a state of readiness for his immediate ends.' Insistence upon this would seem to prevent all possibility of a standard of beauty in the usual sense, for individuality implies universal difference, and, therefore, difference of needs. The empiricist insists that

this difference is, relatively, very small, and is far overshadowed by the qualities which a man shares with others. To the assertion that his beautiful and the useful are hardly distinguishable, he replies that the beautiful is what will be of use in the future, while the useful is what is of immediate, practical value. The beautiful is the supremely useful, the useful stripped of its refractory elements, for man makes use of anything, which, however roughly, will serve his turn. 'The ability of the beautiful to translate itself into the useful constitutes the standard by which the quality of the beauty is to be tested.'

In a work of art a man expresses his desires upon his environment through a medium. At this point the difference between the conception of art held by the idealist and that of the empiricist becomes clear. Beauty in art differs from beauty in life in this respect only, that it is fictional or ideal, not real. Literary art is a species of the genus art, using a medium having its special nature and capacities. The artist in literature, accordingly, seeks to reveal 'what should be' through the medium of words. Words are felt by men to be very close to things. Their essential characteristic as an artistic medium is that they, best of all, can reproduce the progressive and continuous contact of man with his environment. This leads to a definition of literature. 'It is the office of literature to represent ideal (i.e., fictional) action,...which leads towards, and culminates in the imposition of his desires upon it, so that the finished artistic product portrays the environment as it exists subsequent to its subjection to those desires.'

Literature in its turn can be divided into three main classes. It is made to express: (1) personal wishes, depicted as fulfilled, which in real life are incapable of fulfilment, for violation is done to possibility as experience reveals it; (2) personal wishes capable of fulfilment in a very limited and non-general environment only, thus violating probability; (3) probable achievement, in which no violence is done to normal experience. All these classes can give genuine literature, but if literature is to be recognised with other departments of knowledge in respect to its influence on the lives of men, the third class is the most important. Works of literature of each class, in the degree to which they satisfy the respective desires of their readers, are beautiful to their readers. As a consequence the field of literature contains three distinct types of the beautiful. Of these that is highest when fiction is disciplined by probability to attain poetic truth.

It is with this third class that literary criticism can concern itself. No judgment upon impossible fiction can be other than personal. No one can measure another's delight and gratification. Judgments upon improbable fiction must also be largely personal, as indeed might also be those upon probable fiction. This, however, would be a very limited view of them. Reference back can here be made to the environment, to test them. Here is the field for the critic, who possesses both greater familiarity than the average reader with life, and greater knowledge of literature, of its technical resources, and of what can rightly be expected from it.

The analysis of literature from this specific point of view is exceedingly well done. It is acute, clear and consistent, and is a valuable statement of what appears to be the modern attitude to literature. The treatment of the critic and his function is not so good. Professor Brightfield has allowed the analogy with the exact sciences to run away with him, and logic has become his master. He seems determined to make a proud place for the critic, and forgets the simple truth that men, like sheep, need a guide. The reader can with difficulty escape from the disquieting suspicion that Professor Brightfield's head, at least, would have him believe that Mr Wells writing tracts for the times is creating better literature than did the author of *Kipps*, and *Mr Polly*. His critic completes the ideal experiment with life which the artist has begun, referring back his product to the environment, its proper frame. 'He determines, interprets and pronounces the degree of validity of the individual and group aims of men. He determines the "what should be," which always conforms more nearly to instinctive human desires than the "what is".'

In his last chapter, he brings his theories to the evaluation of specific types of literature. Here the clash between empiricism and idealism—the 'issue in literary criticism'—is made most sharply. The idealist considers the lyric the supreme and perfect work of literature. The empiricist calls it the highest achievement in the type of impossible fiction. 'A lyric poem, empirically considered, is a non-narrative piece of literature, which, by the employment of metaphors, symbols, etc....arouses certain vague dispositions to conduct. It seeks vagueness of subject-matter in order to conceal its break with the basic texture of the environment. It employs language, but it ignores the characteristic ability of that medium, the portrayal of an action.' 'Lyric poetry refreshes after toil, and it soothes for defeat. It is thus of considerable significance to human life. By their very nature such satisfactions must be intensely and narrowly personal. Accordingly lyric poetry stands almost entirely outside the range of impersonal critical judgments.' It can only be judged by comparison with others within its group.

The Issue in Literary Criticism, thus briefly summarised, is an honest and consistently logical attempt to apply the philosophical light of empiricism to literature. It is ruthless and relentless in its search for the weak point in idealistic interpretations. It is not a good guide to idealism. It has most of the Procrustean weaknesses which follow complete adherence to any system. It is also, and this is important, an acute and able attempt to find solid ground in the shifting sands of aesthetic theory. Whatever one may think of its main contentions, both its analysis and casual judgments are stimulating.

W. D. THOMAS.

SWANSEA.

L'Amore nella poesia e nel pensiero del rinascimento. By LUIGI TONELLI. Florence: G. C. Sansoni. 1933. 323 pp. 25 lire.

Half a century ago scholars more or less agreed in determining the limits of the Italian Renaissance and in defining its chief characteristics;

and for over a generation the views of Burkhardt, Voigt, Pater, De Sanctis, Bartoli and D'Ancona were accepted without challenge; they were repeated and often exaggerated. But, for some years now, a process of revision has set in by which, one after the other, those concepts that seemed best established have been gradually attacked, and often successfully upset. The admiration for the literary and artistic works of the Renaissance was accompanied by an almost spiteful incomprehension of the men of that epoch and their morals. The Paganism of the Renaissance, Petrarch as the first man of the modern age, the cult of the individual as the key notes of the Renaissance, are notions that, in their absolute form, are now ready for inclusion in that list of literary fallacies, the composition of which Foscolo, alas! unsuccessfully, invoked for Dantean studies. Professor Tonelli in the book under review envisages the Renaissance from the angle of its conception of love, and he argues against the traditional view that the Renaissance was generally amoral or immoral, claiming that, by his investigation of the Renaissance concept of love in all its forms and manifestations, he is providing help towards a better comprehension 'dell' essenza, natura e svolgimento di esso Rinascimento. . . facendoci penetrare nell' anima più profonda di quell' età. . . e svelandoci in parte il suo intimo, singolare mistero.' Unless I am mistaken, there may be some among his readers who will not concede that he has made good so large a claim; for his conclusions may in future be proved to be right, and may have been reached by him with the assistance of flashes of felicitous intuition, but their demonstration is occasionally less detailed and cogent than the laws of critical evidence seem to require. It is Tonelli's interesting contention that the Renaissance achieved a striking originality in connexion with love. Love had been for the ancients either pleasure or intellectual friendship; woman was for them only a means towards the satisfaction of the senses. Medieval men considered love a sin, or to say the least a weakness; the beauty of the human body was a temptation, and woman a source of perdition. For the Renaissance on the contrary love is the essence and the reason of life; human beauty is a sensible revelation of Nature and of the Deity, and woman, as the flower of beauty, is the very source of happiness and the centre of the universe (pp. 315-16).

Professor Tonelli is too cautious a critic not to surround so sweeping a conclusion by many qualifications, particularly with regard to the influence of Plato and of Petrarch, but he asserts that, during the Renaissance, such ancient and medieval conceptions about love as were consistent with the new meaning that life had acquired, were brought together in a synthesis which is neither fully heathen nor fully Christian; it is an original synthesis by which the deeper meaning of the Renaissance is explained, and on which depend Bruno's 'heroic furore,' Campanella's 'amor universal, vero, divino,' and Spinoza's conception (*Tractatus brevis*) of love as the foundation of morals and religion.

All this may be true, and the evidence on which these conclusions rest is marshalled by Tonelli in a series of brilliant chapters, in which popular and learned lyric poetry, epics, *novelle*, memoirs, farces, comedies and

other forms of drama, treatises by scholars and philosophers are all searched for such indications as lend support to this theory. It may be felt by some readers that Tonelli is occasionally too ready in assuming that the passages he quotes are consistent with the general views he expresses; and I think that the rebutting evidence is unwisely passed over in silence: but all must agree that his views, and even more the facts he adduces in their support, as marshalled by him, bring out a new aspect of Renaissance literature, and thus of the Renaissance as a whole. With regard to the lyric poetry of the fifteenth century, he certainly succeeds in making a good case against D'Ancona and all those who *invenaverunt in verba magistri*, for that poetry was no doubt influenced by Petrarch, but it had qualities of its own: there was a power of candid introspection in these poets who seemed to be enraptured by the joy of having escaped from the theological trammels which had held love fast during the Middle Ages. In Tuscany during the earlier part of that century lyric poetry solely dealt with love; and the influence of Petrarch was soon on the wane. How did it happen, but for D'Ancona's authoritativeness, that critics, while admiring Boiardo's joyful and exquisite sentimentality, and his novel outlook upon nature, Lorenzo's felicity of expression so well balanced between realism and idealism, Cariteo's richness and elegance, and the inimitable grace of Poliziano, have so long failed to realize that there was much more than Petrarchism in their poems? Bembo was, on the contrary, unduly praised; his muse, however skilful in craftsmanship, lacks depth of inspiration; but Ariosto's voluptuous and realistic lyrics and elegies, Tansillo's passionate poems, occasionally wrapt in a melancholy which strikes a modern note, Gasparina Stampa's wholehearted rapture should be sufficient by themselves to compel a less inadequate evaluation of fifteenth-century lyric poetry. Gasparina is no doubt uneven, but she often attains greatness, and hers is one of the finest lines in Italian poetry: 'Vivere ardendo e non sentire il male.' Tonelli's is an impressive and convincing survey of which only the main points can here be recorded; among these must be reckoned the analysis of Michelangelo's love poems and the apposite praise given to Pontano's responsiveness to physical beauty. In a later chapter the author argues that the epics of Poliziano and Pulci, and even more those of Boiardo and Ariosto are centred on love; for Boiardo as well as Ariosto were under love's spell, the former smiling on its contradictions, the latter striking with equal power upon all its notes. The writers of *novelle* were prompted by tradition to lay greater stress upon the sensuous aspect of love, and Professor Tonelli endeavours to defend even the coarsest among the *novellieri*, Sermini, against the sweeping condemnation of Vittorio Rossi. It is Tonelli's view that one should take into account the occasions on which Sermini's and other *novelle* were written; and the reasonableness of this view may tend somewhat to moderate the often repeated strictures, without however, succeeding, I think, in invalidating them. In the same way Tonelli's remarks about Firenzuola's *Ragionamenti* may explain the contrast between his realistic tales, and the Platonic discussions to which they give rise, without providing a sufficient

justification for that contrast. The author is on more solid ground when he emphasises the merit of Da Porto's *Giulietta e Romeo*, in which love is represented in its most tragic issues; though he seems unaware of the autobiographical inspiration which appears to me to explain the effectiveness of that tale, as I once tried to prove and may perhaps be pardoned for still holding. This would have provided a link with the following chapter on the *Ricordi e confessioni*, in which some good material is carefully analyzed. Farces and comedies show that love was represented as sensuousness tending either to cynicism or to sentimentality; tragedies naturally provide less, and less convincing, material, and the rather inadequate survey of the great mass of philosophical and pseudo-philosophical treatises is at any rate sufficient to show that there were other tendencies at work besides those which depended upon neo-Platonism and Petrarch, as may be seen in the works of Valla and F. Filelfo (Epicureans); Pontano, Nifo and Equicola (Aristotelians); Alberti and Leonardo (realists), which led Professor Tonelli to assert that whether 'humanly' or transcendently all agreed in extolling love above all other sentiments; so that he feels justified in concluding: 'Basta questo... per convincersi definitivamente dell' originalità del Rinascimento, non solo riguardo al tema particolare dell' amore, ma, poiché questo è fondamentale e cruciale, altresì rispetto alla sua intima essenza.'

Professor Tonelli is aware that this theory would be much strengthened by a parallel survey of the products of the arts, but he thinks that his conclusions would not be modified by it. His contentions are so important and so new that it is to be regretted that he has not endeavoured to make his demonstration complete, by a wider survey as well as by a less inadequate elaboration of some sections of this book. For whatever later developments may be, he has here presented views which will always command the attention of future students of this period, and he has made claims for some works and some poets that it will be very difficult to refute¹.

C. FOLIGNO.

OXFORD.

Life and Manners in Madrid, 1750-1800. By CHARLES E. KANY. Berkeley: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 1932. xiii + 483 pp. 42s.

The *sainetes* of Ramón de la Cruz, the paintings and etchings of Goya and the *Letters from Spain* of Blanco White are the recognised sources for the study of the social scene in the Madrid of the late eighteenth century. Dr Kany, whose studies in the first of these laid the foundation for this handsome and richly illustrated volume, now casts his net much wider and checks the satirists by constant reference to travellers, economists, the statute book, and particularly municipal records and the press.

¹ It is in no carping spirit that attention is called to two misprints; *Chariteo* (p. 56) against *Cariteo* on all other occasions, and *rejete* (p. 175), and to a curious miscalculation on p. 178, where Brognolgo's edition of Bandello's tales is referred to, and it is said that the tales are 214 in four volumes; they are on the contrary 224 in five volumes.

In most of the subjective and much of the objective evidence interest naturally fastens on the picturesque periphery of society, street criers, *petimetres*, royal huntsmen, and Dr Kany definitely excludes 'the economic and political organisation and development of society.' There is thus considerable difference in value between chapters according as they impinge on or are able to avoid fundamentals. Those on Social Types, limited to such as were the butt of caricature, and on Theatres, for example, are satisfactorily exhaustive, whereas a chapter like the last on Culture and Religion, which would properly belong to a book on 'Life and Ideas,' leaves us disappointed on the very threshold of the real significance of this half-century for Spain. The limitation, one need scarcely say, corresponds rather to the subject of the book than to its author.

The keynote of the period, both for manners and for ideas, is struck in the advice given to the first Spanish Bourbon, Philip V, by his grandfather Louis XIV: 'Be a good Spaniard, but remember that you are French by birth.' French modistes, French cooks, French furniture were sought after by all who would be fashionable, we miss a reference to the corollary that this, the second, was the most intensive period of gallicisation of the language. Dr Kany notes, in a note, that of 1786 books published in 1784 some 513 were translations, 'an incontrovertible indication of the translating mania which was gaining more and more ground in Spain.' There was more to it than a mere translating mania, and a scrutiny of the list might well have been worth a place in the text. The century that one is accustomed to dismiss summarily as dull and prosaic was the seed-bed of modern Spain in virtue of its intense pre-occupation with ideas. Dr Kany has now shown that it was not lacking in the picturesque. Had the two worlds fused, the picturesque and the intelligent, it might have been a great age. Instead the present work emphasizes, by implication, how complete was the divorce.

Dr Kany's book constitutes an extremely valuable commentary on the social aspects of eighteenth-century literature and history. Hispanists will regret that the many excerpts from Ramón de la Cruz are given only in translation; the versions are far inferior to the average level of Dr Kany's style.

WILLIAM C. ATKINSON.

GLASGOW.

Ernst Moritz Arndt und Schweden. Von RICHARD WOLFRAM. (*Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte*, LXV.) Weimar: Verlag von Alexander Duncker. 1933. xi + 232 pp. 10 M.

Dr Richard Wolfram has given us a comprehensive and furthering study of Arndt's relations with Sweden. This is the first attempt to cover the field in its entirety, and the author has done so with exemplary thoroughness, utilising a good deal of hitherto unpublished material. He is well qualified for the task: himself descended from a Rügen family, Dr Wolfram has an intimate acquaintance with the scenes of Arndt's early years. He has also had the advantage of going over some of the

ground that Arndt covered on his travels in Sweden, and has had access to private collections of letters throwing light on his activities.

In the earlier chapters we learn how Arndt from the first felt attracted to Sweden, the home of his ancestors, and longed to visit that country. In the autumn of 1803 he was able to carry out this wish and first proceeded to Stockholm and Upsala. The following year was spent in travelling far and wide by post-chaise in the provinces of Central Sweden and Norrland—no small undertaking in those days. After his return to Germany Arndt published his *Journal einer Reise durch Schweden im Jahre 1804*. He had a keen observant eye and an insatiable thirst for knowledge; added to this he had already studied the history of Sweden and was filled with a sympathetic understanding of Swedish life and character. Consequently this diary proved a mine of information on topography, occupations, political conditions and, more especially, folklore; indeed, as Dr Wolfram points out, Arndt may be considered as one of the fathers of modern *Volkskunde*. The *Journal* appears to have aroused but little interest in Germany; but a year after its publication in Berlin a Swedish translation appeared, which ran into a second edition. How much it was appreciated in Sweden is shown by an enthusiastic recension by Archbishop Reuterdahl, to whom it seems to have appealed in the same way as Selma Lagerlöf's charming description of the provinces of Sweden in *Nils Holgersson* appeals to present-day readers.

In his chapter on Arndt's earlier works Dr Wolfram makes an interesting attempt to show points of contact with the Swedish Storm and Stress writer Thomas Thorild, who was exiled in 1793 as the result of his revolutionary views and afterwards became professor of Swedish at Greifswald. His *Ratt eller alla samhällens eviga lag* and Arndt's *Geist der Zeit* have much in common; and whilst Dr Wolfram admits that their views may have flowed in parallel channels, his arguments for direct influence of Thorild on Arndt seem very conclusive.

Dr Wolfram's results may be summed up as follows: Arndt, one of the greatest champions of German liberty, was half Swedish. He played an important part in acquainting Germany with Swedish ways and thought, and on the other hand his writings also influenced the Phosphorists and the development of the Romantic Movement in Sweden. In his earlier works he shows a fervid Swedish particularism and regards Sweden as a northern outpost of liberty. This enthusiasm was toned down by his disappointment at Swedish non-intervention in the war of 1806 between Prussia and France, which turned him into a whole-hearted German patriot. Yet he never lost his early regard for Sweden and always felt a keen sense of the ties of kinship between Germany and the Germanic peoples of the North.

The book contains a considerable number of misprints, especially in the earlier chapters; several place-names are misspelt, and on p. 37 the date '1894' should be '1794.' An appendix gives the Swedish originals of the letters and other documents utilised.

R. J. McCLEAN.

SHORT NOTICES

In *Drydens heroische Tragodien als Ausdruck hofischer Barockkultur in England* (Englisches Seminar der Universitat Tubingen, 1932. 72 pp.), a brief doctoral dissertation, Dr Wolfgang Mann maintains that the heroic drama is a product of literary baroque (this being defined according to Professor Walzel) and that its principal idea is courtly culture. He argues that, owing to the aristocratic nature of the Restoration audience and the royalist spirit abroad in the age, Dryden's heroic plays were definitely tendentious in their exaggerated support of absolute monarchy and their disregard of all that was non-courtly. The element of courtly baroque enters in the attitude of his royal characters towards love and honour and in their subordination of life to both. Dr Mann points out that only 'great souls,' such as kings and princes, are capable of the heroic-baroque attitude towards death, whereby fate is defied and death itself is conquered by the character's will to die. The heroic drama, again, is dominated by the pregnant moment, usually the occasion of the most astonishing reversals of attitude and intention (e.g., 'That was my will of half an hour ago. But now 'tis altered!'); all that lies between such crises of life is negligible. Extremes are all-important, and no compromise is conceivable. The figures who move in this violently astonishing world seem to have no inner nature, nor even is their superficial character consistent; action and character bear no real relation to each other. Moreover, as Dr Mann points out, there is considerable difficulty for the spectator in keeping rogues and noble characters distinct, since the feelings of each type move in the same channels towards love or ambition, or, more generally, both; for the love is intimately bound up with political happenings.

All this is true, but it is a little difficult to see wherein lies the originality of this book. Dr Mann has, perhaps, added a fresh label to Dryden's heroic plays, but the features which he cites to justify it have long been familiar and the quotations are inevitable. Moreover one suspects that, in spite of the imposingly obscure opening definition of 'literary baroque,' the term really means little more for the author than 'literary grotesque.'

F. E. B.

In *The Genius of Keats* (London: A. H. Stockwell. 1932. 202 pp. 6s.) Professor A. W. Crawford has re-surveyed the poetic output of Keats's *annus mirabilis*, 1819, with a view to demonstrating that 'here, much more than in any previous period, he was quite consciously endeavouring to construct a philosophy of life.' On the perhaps over-discussed question of 'poetry of sensation' *versus* 'poetry of thought' in Keats, this author ranges himself wholeheartedly with Messrs Middleton Murry, Fausset, and Thorpe, against Professor Garrod. The latter, most of us are probably agreed, was guilty of an extravagance in arguing that Keats's 'craving for thought' tended to 'spoil his singing.' But Professor Crawford is not

satisfied with the now familiar contention that Keats would probably have developed into a great philosophical poet; he thinks that the Keats of 1819 had already done so, that the true greatness of the *Odes*, *Lamia* and *Hyperion* is to be traced to their 'deep philosophical content.' The interpretations of individual poems offered in support of this position are not very convincing. *Lamia*, for instance, we are required to take as 'a picture of Keats as he might have become had he given way to his sensuous impulses and not heeded his philosophy.' The notorious lines about 'cold philosophy' (Part II, l. 229 *sq.*) are consequently declared to be not the poet's thought at all, but 'the dramatic utterance of the serpent-lady.' Surely Professor De Selincourt was nearer the truth in taking these lines at their face value, but adding the comment that the whole poem is 'the utterance of a mood rather than a settled conviction'? Serious objections to Professor Crawford's general argument are, first, that 'philosophy' has to be given so wide a meaning as to become almost meaningless (thus on p. 186 *The Ancient Mariner* and *Christabel* are called 'great philosophical poems'); secondly, that it involves a questionable segregation of the poems written after from those written before the spring of 1819—whatever we may think of the 'allegory' or 'symbolism' of *Endymion*, there is at least as much of it in that poem as in *Lamia* or even *Hyperion*. And lastly, like many of those who pitch somewhat too high their praise of Keats as a thinker, Professor Crawford almost ignores some of his finest poems: *Isabella*, *The Eve of St Agnes*, and the marvellous *Ode to Autumn* are barely mentioned.

R. W. K.

In *An Analytical Study of Shelley's Versification* (University of Iowa Humanistic Studies, v, No. 3. 1933. 75 pp. \$0.75), Miss Louise Propst has carried out with industry and intelligence a task of somewhat restricted usefulness. By a minute (and, it must be said, sometimes rather mechanical) examination of the metrical and stanzaic form in a hundred and five of the shorter poems, she seeks to make clear 'the reciprocal use of uniformity and variety, the blending of tradition and innovation' in Shelley's prosody. Though there is little to surprise us in Miss Propst's general conclusions, it is interesting to follow her detailed demonstrations of such things as the poet's skill in interweaving iambic and anapæstic effects in *The Cloud*, *When the lamp is shattered*, and elsewhere; and her comments on the rhythmical peculiarities of some of the more complex poems, such as the *Ode to a Skylark* and the *Lines written among the Euganean Hills*, are careful and sensitive. But, even if it be granted that a separate examination of the lyrics was worth while, the entire omission not only of most of the earlier work but of all the lyrics and choruses in *Prometheus Unbound*, *Hellas* and other long poems is not easy to justify. It certainly makes pointless the statistical appendices with their classified lists of 'Basic Metres' and of 'Stanzaic Forms.' The lack of an index of titles and/or of first lines is also to be regretted—especially as the only references given are to the pages of an American edition of Shelley which is rarely used in this country.

R. W. K.

In *Soziale Lyrik in England 1880-1914* (Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1932. 108 pp. 5 M.) Dr Eva Walraf examines the reflection of social ideas and conditions upon English poetry during the thirty years preceding the Great War. The names of the six writers chosen as instances—William Morris, John Davidson, Stephen Phillips, Laurence Binyon, F. M. Hueffer and W. W. Gibson—indicate the difficulty experienced by the author in relating the by-ways of her theme to its main objective, a difficulty which she has not entirely succeeded in surmounting. Her introductory chapter, a succinct and readable account of social movements during the nineteenth century, occupying one third of the whole thesis, is little concerned with lyrical poetry. In the remainder some attempt is made to discriminate between the idealism of Morris, the self-expressive realism of Davidson, the academic humanitarianism of Binyon and Phillips and the more dramatic psychology of Gibson. But the chapters are out of proportion, in some cases over-compressed, in others unduly discursive. Dr Walraf's dissertation, which is well documented, should prove valuable to specialists in her field; but it will hardly commend itself to the general reader.

B. E. C. D.

Literary Sessions, by Eric Partridge (London: Scholartis Press. 1932. x + 201 pp. 7s. 6d.) brings together in book form fifteen Essays of which nine have appeared before in various journals and reviews. They are printed with all the regard for good appearance which one associates with productions of the Scholartis Press, and are also for the most part good examples of the interesting knowledge of odd and neglected corners of literature which Mr Partridge possesses. The most interesting essays in the book are the brief accounts of authors now little known, some little regarded, such as R. H. Horne, and a valuable little life of Ambrose Bierce. Five papers on topics related to medicine preserve many a quaint piece of information. These are all interesting, and well worth preserving.

W. D. T.

We have received a 'special number' of the *Bullettino degli studi inglesi in Italia*, the organ of the 'Associazione fra i diplomati dell'Istituto Britannico,' edited by Professor Piero Rébora (British Institute of Florence, April, 1933). It contains an interesting suggestion by Mr Harold Goad, the Director of the Institute, that the figure, sometimes called 'Cimabue,' in the frescoes of the Spanish Chapel may be a portrait of an English knight of the garter, Edward le Despenser, and an important article, 'Il Moro di Venezia,' by Count Andrea da Mosto. Here the Director of the Archivio di Stato of Venice, comparing Shakespeare's *Othello* with the novel in the *Ecatommisti*, produces a series of documents which tend to identify the 'capitano moro' of Giraldis with a certain Francesco da Sessa—called in the documents 'Maurus' or 'il Capitaneo Moro'—who in 1545 was sent in chains from Cyprus to Venice, and there tried and condemned for an unnamed offence. There are various points of close correspondence between the documents and the 'novella,' and, if it could only be established that this mysterious crime was the murder of the captain's wife, the identification would be fairly complete.

E. G. G.

The difficulties by which also the publishing trade is beset have but slightly reduced the total number of books issued in Italy, but they have much altered the balance in favour of novels, translations, political works, and proportionately restricted purely critical and historical publications. But the number of reviews and weekly periodicals has much increased, many of them being fortunately or unfortunately of an ephemeral character; as a result it is well nigh impossible for students who are living outside Italy, and must be difficult also for those who are in daily touch with Italian libraries, to get timely information about all that is published on any given subject. Journals such as the *Italia che Scrive* and *Leonardo*, and of course also, if less promptly, the *Giornale Storico* are of great assistance, but their accounts cannot be fully classified, and cannot take cognisance of odd articles appearing in political weekly and daily periodicals, and are not indexed. It is for this reason that *La Scheda Cumulativa Italiana* (Anacapri, The Italian Literary Guide Service, 1932) fulfils at the modest cost of 60 lire a useful object by providing a list of books and articles under three headings (author, title and subject) including also articles which appear in political dailies. The editor endeavours to cover the whole field of learned, as well as of creative literature and science from the angle of American and British interest; and of course he cannot be expected to avoid gaps and omissions, particularly as not all the academical publications seem to come under his notice; but, even as it now is, *La Scheda Cumulativa* provides a most welcome help to the specialist and is a tool which any one who is not a specialised scholar with ready access to good libraries, cannot well do without. It is to be hoped that this new publication will meet with success, and that its editor will be encouraged, and enabled by success, to fill such gaps as are observable in the first volume (1932). C. F.

The chief interest of the article contributed by Professor Michele Barbi to the *Enciclopedia Italiana* and now slightly revised and published separately (*Dante: Vita, opere e fortuna*. Florence, Sansoni, 1933), apart from the up-to-dateness of the information, lies in the author's endeavour to eschew the usual perils of this kind of work, such as hero-worship, excessive compression leading to dryness, and assertiveness. The readers who are aware of Barbi's life-long and strikingly successful labours on minute points of criticism, on the classification and publication of manuscripts, and the unearthing of documentary evidence, cannot but be struck by the attitude he assumes here, of apparent indifference towards his own and his colleagues' investigations of minute points of scholarship, and by his desire to tell Dante's life story in the simplest of forms, keeping to essentials and writing of him almost as if he had been an ordinary man. It would be as presumptuous as it would be superfluous to dwell upon the minute, if dissembled, accuracy of information that underlies this work; and it is with much hesitation that one reader ventures to observe that perhaps the endeavour to attain lightness of touch by discarding the habits of a lifetime has gone too far and has proved costly, for it causes an impression of flippancy which was not in the author's intention. All who are interested in Dante, whether specialists or not,

will have recourse to this booklet, for, coming from Barbi's pen, it is the most authoritative record available of the state of present-day Dantean scholarship; but precisely on this account the paucity of dates which are provided and the tone with which certain questions of detail are touched upon, cannot but prove tantalising to many. In addition to the article from the *Enciclopedia* Barbi has here re-issued, bringing them up to date, three admirable articles which show him at his best. Each of them aims at pointing out the perils of inadequate information in dealing with Dante: the first one being a review (first published in *Pègaso*, October 1929) of the over-praised *Vita di Dante* by Duke Gallarati Scotti; while the second and third deal with the cantos of Francesca and of Farinata respectively (and were published in *Studi Danteschi*, xvi, 1932, and viii, 1924). They are models of courteous but uncompromising criticism, and should prove a warning to all who may be tempted to rush into the arena of Dantean studies shirking the toil of a necessarily laborious preparation.

C. F.

The publishers claim on the wrapper of Professor Arthur Burkhard's *Conrad Ferdinand Meyer: the Style and the Man* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1932. ix + 225 pp. 13s.), that it is the 'first comprehensive treatment in English of the eminent Swiss writer.' The claim of priority is not to be gainsaid; but should an English reader, tempted by this advertisement, turn to this volume for an introduction to Meyer's life and work, he is bound to be disappointed. Professor Burkhard's book is a specialised treatise of a type at present in fashion in the German academic world, on Meyer's use of words, phrases and style, and deducing from them his mental characteristics. The titles of his chapters, 'Struggle for Expression,' 'Grand Style and Manner,' 'Concrete Forms and Moving Figures,' and the inevitable 'Principle of Polarity,' indicate the range of the work. So far from being a 'comprehensive treatise,' it seems to leave the reader without any clear picture of Meyer's achievement as a creative artist at all. Indeed, we only learn Professor Burkhard's opinion of the intrinsic or comparative merits of Meyer's works between the lines when he relaxes the stringency of his method. The method itself seems to me exceedingly meagre in tangible results. Moreover, such a book is only readable by one to whom Meyer's prose and poetry are completely familiar, and even then, it does not touch on what to most older readers of that work to-day is the most urgent problem: to explain the failing vitality of it compared with the achievement of his greater fellow-countryman Gottfried Keller. Indeed, one suspects that it is often just these stylistic qualities on which Professor Burkhard concentrates his attention that have proved in the long run 'wurmstichig.' Style, without something more behind, is a bad passport to immortality.

J. G. R.